LABOUR MONTHLY

A Magazine of International Labour

Editor: R. Palme Dutt

MORE LIGHT ON KOREA

D. N. PRITT, K.C.

March, 1951

Price: One Shilling

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE FIRST THOUSAND MORE

NEWS of our readers' own circulation drive: we had to increase our print for this number by 1,000. Congratulations! Circulation-Raiser No. 1 forms (again to be found on the back cover) are still pouring in. From India, Scotland, Wales, Ireland: and also from 23 English counties (the greatest number from Yorkshire, with Lancashire a very close second and Gloucestershire not so far behind). Of the big cities, London came first with Sheffield and Birmingham tying and Bristol next (Bristol Rovers, please note!) But this is no knock-out Cup Final; it is more the fight for the head of the championship tables. When this appears, form may be already reversed; for if only Manchester were United, Lancashire might already be in the lead. The quality remains high. There was the Literature Organiser of a Trades Council who, 'as an old friend of *Labour Monthly*, keen to help in circulation raising', sent a valuable list of prospective readers to be forwarded specimen copies. There were the three London enthusiasts who got together and made a list of their own relatives from which they sternly excluded all who were not active in the Labour Party. (I hope that soon they will include even the rest of each family!) No room for the replies of those to whom specimen copies were sent, from the North East coast University student to the London taxi driver: but it has brought out more than one curious and human story. For example, the two artists who had long lost touch with each other, and now renew their friendship, both finding they have trodden the same path—into the Labour movement. A charming letter in most beautiful hand-writing from a septuagenarian, writing of William Morris and his outlook in warm and personal terms—which gives me a reminder of where William Morris would stand today. Now on to the Second Thousand.

CIRCULATION-RAISER No. 2

Get your local newsagent to display 'Labour Monthly'

A group of London readers write: 'We are asking our local newsagent to display a copy, guaranteeing to pay for it at the end of the month if it is not sold'. An interesting idea. There is at present an agreement in the trade not to supply periodicals on sale or return. Originally introduced owing to the war-time paper shortage, now it has been sharpened because of rearmament stock-piling. Naturally newsagents tend to take only enough supplies of magazines which they regard as of 'specialist interest' to satisfy customers who place regular orders. So they keep *Labour Monthly* 'under the counter'. Why put it out for display among the quick-selling tripe, cheap or 'glossy', when it is already reserved for a firm customer? Why risk losing profit on firm sales by having an extra copy on their hands? How is the average news-agent or book-stall manager to know that there would be a keen demand from what the advertisement copy writers call the 'discerning customer'? Accuse

Continued on inside back cover.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Vol. XXXIII, No. 3 CONTENTS March, 1951

Page

NOTES OF THE MONTH: Let the Lion Roar, by R.P.D. 97

MORE LIGHT ON KOREA: by D. N. Pritt, K.C. 109

THE LABOUR GOVERNMENT AND LABOUR'S FUTURE: by Quæstor .. 117

CONCERNING PRACTICE (Part 2): by Mao Tse-tung 128

STILLS FROM CHINESE FILM 121-122

TWENTY-FIVE YEARS AGO 136

Book Reviews:

I Believed, by Douglas Hyde: *R. Palme Dutt* 137

Marx-Engels Selected Works: *Clemens Dutt* 141

Women and Communism: *George Thomson* 141

New China, Friend or Foe?: *R. Westgate* 142

Lysenko is Right: *L.E.* 143

Bull's Penny: *W. Lauchlan* 144

Publications Received 144

Notes of the Month

Let the Lion Roar

'There are discernible the beginnings of a fear that . . . the world is in the process of abandoning America'.

Sydney Morning Herald, February 4, 1951.

IT moves. The crisis of the American War Alliance has come into the open. After the fiasco in the Far East the stirring spreads in Western Europe. General Eisenhower, after his lightning tour of ten capitals to build up the American Satellite Army of Aggression in Western Europe, returns discomfited to report to the startled American Senate his impression of the Western European peoples that 'their spirit was smothered with war weariness . . . the validity of many pessimistic reports' (*The Times*, February 3). These miserable weaklings and defeatists of France and Britain, of Belgium and Holland, who stood up undaunted to the horrors of Nazism, who won their salvation thanks to the mighty victorious blows of their

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Soviet allies, actually have the insolence to appear unwilling to march under the orders of Wall Street alongside the Nazi murderers and criminals against their Soviet comrades. Extraordinary. Treason. Subversion. From across the Atlantic sounds the answering rumble of the infuriated Hoovers and Tafts to wipe off Europe from the slate as already lost. The wind of freedom is blowing over the world, from Seoul and Peking to London and Paris. Let it rise to a gale and cleanse the soil from the warmakers.

The Lion Stirs

Not only in the countries of the Western European Continent, in France and Italy and Germany, the peoples are moving against the American war plans. Most significant of all, and most important for the future, the stirring begins to make itself felt also in Britain. It is still only a beginning. But the beginning is unmistakable. The climate is changing. As surely as the national revolt of the British people rose in anger in 1938-39 against the disastrous policies of Munich and Chamberlain, against the Old Munich policies of blind anti-Soviet hostility leading to appeasement of Hitler and the unloosing of the second world war, so surely today the national revolt of the British people is beginning against the New Munich policies of Attlee, Morrison, Bevin and the Tory Die-Hards, against the same disastrous policies of senseless anti-Soviet hostility leading to appeasement of the war-mad rulers of America and a third world war. Last time the awakening was too slow to avert catastrophe. This time the awakening must advance quickly. There is no time to be lost. The plans for war are being pressed forward with reckless speed. As war move succeeds war move with ever increasing openness, the blinkers begin to fall. Eyes are opening. The lion is stirring. But the lion must move quickly if he is not to fall into the pit that is being dug for him.

'Awake, Arise! Or be for ever fallen'.

National Revolt

Goad after goad is being dug into the flesh of the patient British people. First, MacArthur. Now Eisenhower and Herod. First, the senseless military adventure in the Far East and provocation of China, with whom Britain needs friendship. Now the crippling burden of the imposed £4,700 million arms programme and the remilitarisation of Western Germany. The cynical and shameless plans for Nazi rearmament, the release of Krupp and the Nazi war criminals,

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

coming on top of the MacArthur adventurism in the Far East, have let loose a flood. From the most varied quarters, from groups of influential Labour M.P.s (who would undoubtedly carry already a majority but for fear of the delicate electoral-parliamentary situation), from trade union leaders like the Railwaymen's Secretary, Figgins, from Labour theorists like Cole, from public meetings on China throughout the country, from the British Legion London Conference, from representatives of the Churches like Bishop Barnes, from progressive Conservatives like Viscount Hinchingbrooke, the note of alarm and warning, which previously came only from the Communists and those close to them, is sounding today.

Pointers to the Future

This movement of opinion and popular expression is still scattered, hesitant, divided, lagging behind the urgent needs of the situation and the potential support that can be won. Advance is still held back by the peculiar deadlock of the party political situation, and the consequent understandable fear of the Labour and progressive forces to play into the hands of a Tory comeback. But the way forward must be found, if the very menace that is feared is not to be realised. Against the ominous signs of a return of Tory reaction, signs which are in fact the other side of the medal and a reflection of the present crisis and mass disillusionment, the only alternative and way forward lies through the revival of a mighty united popular movement, led by the Labour and progressive forces, to save Britain and peace. It is in this situation that the new Communist Party Programme takes on a timely significance as a contribution to show a positive long-term perspective for the British people to achieve the aims of peace, of national independence and of advance to real social change.

Mr. Attlee's Surrender

The most outstanding feature of the foreign policy debate in the House of Commons on February 12 was that nearly all the Labour back bench speakers sounded the note of warning and criticism against the Government's policy, while the support for the Premier came from the Tory benches. Mr. Attlee's speech revealed a new depth in the surrender of British interests to United States pressure, which had been already the outcome of the Washington talks in December. That curious organ of ultra-Tory panicmongering and war hysteria, the *Review of World Affairs,* gave in its February issue a characteristic and melodramatic narrative (of course 'from

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the highest level ') of the supposed content of those talks. According to this account, Mr. Attlee presented himself as 'the spokesman for the entire western world outside the United States':

> He said, in effect, that the entire free world had risen in revolt against its leader, the United States. This revolt, he maintained, was supported by all political parties, from the British Government's left-wing back-benchers to the extremists of the Right in Italy. It was *a revolt of the people,* according to Mr. Attlee, which had forced itself from below upon the governments of the free nations and *had finally forced him to come to Washington.*
>
> Mr. Truman began to show signs, first of utter amazement, then of shock, and finally of consuming but politely repressed rage. . .
>
> As an indication of British public opinion, Mr. Attlee quoted a speaker in the House of Lords who, he alleged, had said in debate: 'In every part of the nation people are asking, 'Is General MacArthur trying to start a third world war?' At this point Mr. Truman's face reddened visibly.

Truth and Fiction

This account evidently bears the impress of those American circles which have already branded Mr. Attlee as a notorious crypto-communist, still holding aloft the clenched fist from the days of Spain. But its interest lies, not so much in any estimate of its veracity, as in the atmosphere revealed. For in fact Mr. Attlee did not fly to Washington to voice the revolt of the British people against the American warlords, any more than Chamberlain flew to Munich to voice the revolt of the British people against Hitler. Mr. Attlee flew to Washington, as Chamberlain flew to Munich, precisely because the revolt of the British people was endangering the whole policy of appeasement and the war alliance, and in order to reach a new agreement to cement the war alliance and check the revolt. The outcome of the Washington talks was a deep surrender of British interests at every point to the United States demands. Its sequel is written in the Brussels War Plan, the £4,700 million arms programme, the Eisenhower command of British forces, the signature of the United States resolution branding China, and the acceptance of the plans for Nazi rearmament.

The Open Rift

Nevertheless, all this surrender and loud proclamation of official agreement cannot paper over the real deepening chasm which reveals itself anew at each turn of the road. Less than two months after the Washington talks, by the last week of January, *The Times* was writing on January 24 about 'the crisis of confidence in the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

United Nations which on this Chinese issue is threatened with disruption and chaos'. The *Washington Post* on January 25 spoke of 'the widening gap between British and American opinion'. The New York *Herald Tribune* urged that 'the two great English-speaking Allies' would need, following Mr. Attlee's speech in parliament, 'to survey the damage and repair the breach'. The *Baltimore Sun* read a funeral sermon and announced that 'the split in the ranks of the free countries of the West comes perilously close to being an accomplished fact'. This is to leave out of account the lesser fry among the sensational press on either side, who enjoyed to the full the heaven-sent opportunity to release many pent-up emotions.

'The Stronger Pull'

Does this mean that the British Government for once struggled up from its knees and stood up to the United States at least on the vital issue of China and the Far East? Unfortunately the outcome proves the contrary. The British Government showed itself weaker than the far from powerful Government of Nehru. The British Government, under the test of pressure, proved incapable of even showing the degree of courage and independence shown by the Indian Government in making an open stand against the United States on the issue of the resolution on China. Indeed, the lower organs of the American press accused Britain of 'using the Hindus and Arabs to do what they dared not do openly—double-cross the United States'. But a more responsible organ like the *New York Times* on January 30 (on the eve of Britain caving in to vote for the United States resolution) drew with satisfaction the opposite conclusion:

> England gives the impression these days of the circus strong man who shows that he can stand firm while two horses pull in opposite directions. The drag from America in the West and India in the East is, however, unequal, for we have the stronger pull.

'*We have the stronger pull*'. Such is the halcyon description by the leading organ of American official circles to celebrate the honeymoon relations between America and Britain.

Slippery Slope

This reality of the rift and division of interests, however, does not exclude the parallel and even at the moment paramount reality of the continuous and deepening surrender of British interests by the present British Government to United States pressure. We have already seen this in the case of German rearmament. In March of

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

last year Mr. Bevin pledged the Government to resist any proposal for German rearmament with irreconcilable opposition:

> We have set our faces—the United States, France and ourselves—against the rearming of Germany, and that we must adhere to.
>
> (Mr. Bevin in the House of Commons, March 28, 1950.)

In September 'Mr. Bevin went to New York, determined to prevent the precipitate rearmament of Germany. . . Faced with an American ultimatum . . . he toed the line' (*New Statesman and Nation*, December 2, 1950). And by February Mr. Attlee could roundly declare without a blush that 'we have agreed in principle to German rearmament' and condemn the 'Soviet policy' (i.e., Potsdam policy signed with the bond of Britain and America) for 'the demilitarisation and neutralisation of Germany'.

Into the Abyss

Now we have gone through the same experience with regard to the United States resolution, fiercely demanded by the MacArthurs and Chiang Kai-sheks, to brand China as an 'aggressor' because Chinese volunteers have dared to help the Korean people to defend themselves against the invasion of their country by the Western Powers. On January 23 Mr. Attlee in the House of Commons explicitly and publicly condemned such a proposal: 'We are of the opinion that the United Nations should not at this stage take a new and important decision'. The British representative in the United Nations, the television screen-star hero, Sir Gladwyn Jebb, eloquently set out the reasons against adopting it. The United States was at first alone in proposing this resolution. Then pressure followed. The Asian and Arab States, conscious of the intensity of anti-imperialist feeling at home, resisted. Britain caved in. Under cover of a few meaningless face-saving clauses thrown in about the 'Good Offices Committee' ('good offices' for a supposed 'aggressor'! what a mockery of cynical hypocrisy too tired even to try to be plausibly hypocritical!), which changed not a whit the warlike essence of the resolution, the British vote was obediently cast on February 1 for the United States resolution. At the Assembly next day the usual fictitious 'majority' of docile and paid puppets carried the United States resolution by 44 to 7, with nine abstentions —representing in fact, by populations, a minority of 546 millions for the resolution and a majority of 1,064 millions against, with 186 millions abstaining. Thus, with Britain playing the most ignominious rôle, the shameful, lying and unrepresentative resolution was

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

steamrollered through, which, as Premier Nehru justly observed in the Indian Legislative Assembly on February 12, 'for the time being at least put an end to any attempts at negotiation for a settlement' and has imperilled the future for peace in the Far East.

The Great Contradiction

But the contradiction remains. Consider for a moment the character of General Eisenhower's Report to Congress after his inspection tour of the new vassal area of Western Europe. He spoke of 'the discouragement, the defeatism, the destruction that have been visited on Europe'. He said that 'two world wars had sapped their productive capacity and in some cases reduced them to levels of near-starvation'. He found that 'their spirit was smothered in war-weariness'. He confirmed 'the validity of many pessimistic reports'. And then he proclaimed the grand parallel theorem of the inspired strategists of the Pentagon that the great bulk of the American Army of Aggression in Europe must be drawn from this truly Falstaffian picture of 'discouraged' 'defeatist' 'near-starving' 'war-weary' masses of Western Europe in order to shift the burden from the well-fed shoulders of profit-making America:

> Europe must provide the bulk of the foot soldiers. Ours is to be the small fraction, not the great fraction of the troops.

No wonder the American strategists turn eagerly to release the scum of Nazism from the gaols in order to find their army, and the same Eisenhower pays admiring tribute to 'the honour of the German soldier' revealed in the blood-soaked record of ruin and rapine over the occupied territories of Europe. Such are the dreams of these heirs of Hitler. But the fate of Hitler's armies on the Eastern Front has shown the fate which awaits aggressors; and the lesson of that experience has bitten deep into the masses of the German people, who are showing no eagerness to follow the war-mad incitements of the Adenauers and Schumachers in order to perish in a new holocaust for the benefit of the dollar.

Contradiction Upon Contradiction

But the contradiction of the whole American War Plan for Europe, to make Western Europe the marshalling ground and cockpit for their schemes for an aggressive world war, runs even deeper. For the purposes of popular consumption the entire plan has to be presented as a plan 'only for defence'—against the supposed overhanging daily and hourly menace of being overrun by Russian

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

hordes. With the monotonous iteration of a cheapjack who has only one line of patter, and has to sell his wares at any cost, Mr. Attlee repeats his monstrous legend (blandly ignoring all facts) that the Soviet armies 'never demobilised' and are massed in readiness to overrun and devour at a moment's notice the helpless disarmed peoples of Britain, France and Western Europe. No doubt, knowing the intense hatred of war on the part of his Labour audience, he judges that only such a crude and crass legend can serve to put over the American War Plan. Therefore, it is loudly proclaimed in every Cabinet Minister's speech and every leading article of the kept press, the economies of Western Europe must now be strained to breaking point, belts must be tightened anew, the bottom of the barrel must be scraped, in order to pile division upon division, gun upon gun, and tank upon tank, and draw in every ally, however disreputable, so as to build up sufficient armies and rearmament to be able to stand up to the hypothetical menace of a Soviet onslaught by 1952—or 1953—or 1954. Such is the beautiful logic of the official case.

Answer, Please

But, the man in the street will ask, if it is true that the Soviet armies are incomparably stronger than the present available forces of Western Europe, and if it is true that the ruthless Soviet rulers are determined to overrun and conquer Western Europe (and both these 'facts' are dinned into us daily by our official guides and mentors, whether Tory or official Labour, as the cardinal 'realities' of the present world situation), why in blazes do they not do it at once when we are supposed to be a ripe helpless plum ready to drop into their laps? What earthly sense does it make to imagine that these supposed cold-blooded aggressors will solemnly wait a few years until they are quite sure we have sufficient arms and divisions to withstand successfully, so as to be certain of delivering their devilish attack under the most unfavourable conditions? Yet this lunacy is the official case for the present rearmament programme.

Atomic Illusions

The only attempted answer that has ever been offered is the weak and worn out Churchillian myth of the atom bomb as the supposed 'sole deterrent' holding back the Russian hordes from sweeping over the capitals of Western Europe. But by now all the mili-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tary experts, even the stupidest American military experts, have long ago abandoned this myth and agreed that the atom bomb is no decisive military weapon. Yet if this exploded myth of the miraculous power of the atom bomb is once abandoned, the conclusion becomes inescapable. There is only one possible explanation why the supposed overwhelmingly superior Soviet armies have not swept over the supposed helpless and 'disarmed' Western Europe—and that is because they have not the slightest wish to do so. In other words, not as a question of subjective opinion, but as a question of demonstrable fact, the Soviet people and the peoples of Eastern Europe want peace and the all-round reduction of armaments, as their statesmen repeatedly declare. But if the truth of this is once realised, a very different future opens for Europe—far removed from the American War Plan.

Mr. Lippmann's Theory

The ingenious Mr. Lippman, always a shade more intelligent than his colleagues of the American war camp, at any rate recognises this dilemma, which knocks the bottom out of the whole official case for rearmament, and tries to find a solution. He has announced that the real purpose of the colossal rearmament programmes now being imposed by American pressure upon the Western Europe countries cannot be regarded as justified from a merely military point of view, to be capable of defeating a hypothetical future Soviet assault, but that the real aim is moral and psychological, to restore the morale of the Western European countries as elements in the 'Western' orbit (i.e., in the American orbit):

> Nobody in Europe really believes that an army capable of defeating the Red Army can be assembled quickly in Europe. . .
>
> The real reason for rearming the Western nations, for organising an Atlantic Army with an American Commander, for enlarging our own forces on the European continent—and for rearming in any form at all the West Germans—is that this is essential in order to restore the inner stability, the national self-respect, the diplomatic weight, the sovereign authority and independence of the great nations of our Western society. This effort is more one of reconstruction than of sheer defence.
>
> (Walter Lippmann in the New York *Herald Tribune*, January 31, 1951.)

Beware

Most ingenious. Try that next time, Messrs. Attlee, Shinwell and Strachey, when you next want to put over the burdens of the arms programme and Nazi rearmament for an audience of angry Labour

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

housewives or Z reservists. Explain that it is not really for defence, but for 'national self-respect', as a wonderful new kind of 'reconstruction'—almost an integral part of 'Democratic Socialism'. No? You are quite right. It will not wash. It is true that Lippmann has let out one of the cats in the bag of the American monopolists. The gigantic rearmament programme imposed by American Big Business on Western Europe, the establishment of American Commanders-in-Chief and American Industrial Dictators, is not merely a military operation, but a method of tightening the grip of American imperialism on Western Europe—the sequel to the Marshall Plan. It is true that the atmosphere of war hysteria and phony scares and colossal war orders is 'good for business', boosts up prices and profits, and makes possible the imposition of new burdens on the workers. So also Hitler presented his rearmament programme in Germany as a magical system of 'reconstruction' successfully maintaining 'full employment'. But the end was war. The aim of the American War Plan is war. It is true that the official military argument, handed out to be peddled by the Attlees and Shinwells, is contradictory rubbish, because it is based on a supposed purpose of 'defence' against an imaginary Soviet attack, and on this basis the arguments do not add up. *But the purpose of the American War Plan is not the defence of Western Europe. The purpose is to use Western Europe as an American base for the plans of aggressive war.* If in the course of this war Western Europe is devastated and laid waste like Korea, that is of no more concern to the high American strategists than the fate of Korea and the murdered Korean people.

Professor Cole's Dilemma

In his important and widely welcomed article in the *New Statesman and Nation* of February 3 Professor Cole, the former Chairman of the Fabian Society who resigned over Korea, has taken a firm and courageous stand against the American War Plan. He said:

> If Great Britain gets dragged into war with China by the Americans, I shall be on the side of China.

That is well said. That is a breath of old socialist principle, of democratic principle, and of true patriotism, against those who have forgotten what such things mean. He said:

> If Great Britain agrees to rearm Western Germany, I shall feel unable to take any further part in exhorting the British workers to make an all-out productive effort in order to produce arms for a war in Europe that will no longer be in any sense a war for freedom and democracy.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

That statement of a veteran and honourable Labour Party fighter is also well worth preserving as a signpost, if a time of testing should come. But then Professor Cole expresses a sense of difficulty how to carry forward the fight for these aims:

> I am deeply distrustful of Communists. . . I want, not to side with the Soviet Union or the Western Communists against the Americans, but to make a stand for peace and democratic Socialism against them both.
>
> How to do this, except by writing down frankly what I believe and hoping that it will serve as some encouragement to others who broadly agree with me, I do not know.

How to do this . . . I do not know. If this were the end of the story, it would be an unhappy end. But it need not be the end.

We Can Fight and Win

There is no need of this sense of helplessness. Professor Cole has already begun to show what can be done by writing this article; and this can be only a beginning if the issues are as seriously felt as is declared. Every socialist, every Labour party member, every trade unionist and co-operator, every worker in a factory, and every intellectual can help in this common fight. There is no question of Communists trying to impose their views on other sections in this broad fight for the simple aims of peace and national independence against the American war policy. The fight can and must be carried forward in every organisation. It is the fight that matters; it is the policy that matters; and as we find ourselves fighting in practice for common aims, so we shall find the way to closer co-operation and common understanding from the very needs and experience of the struggle, because, to win, we need unity as a living being needs air and water.

A Programme For Victory

The new Programme of the Communist Party, ' The British Road to Socialism ', is no sectional programme. It is a contribution from one section for the consideration of all sections of the labour movement. It is a programme to chart the way forward for the whole labour movement and for the whole British people. It is a programme to show the way to win victory for peace, and to show the decisive part which the British people can play in the present world situation in winning this victory. It is a programme to end the present American domination of Britain, to restore the national independence of Britain and at the same time, as the indispensable

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

counterpart of this, to establish the national independence of all the peoples of the present British Empire, and on this basis to make possible a voluntary fraternal association for mutual assistance and economic benefit, for the protection of the national independence thus won, and for the service of the cause of peace in common with all the progressive and peace-loving peoples of the world. It is a programme to end the present monopolist domination and ownership of Britain, to rally the majority of the people around a united fighting labour movement in order to transform parliament into their instrument for decisive social change, to make democracy real by striking at the strongholds of economic and political power of the monopolists, to carry through large-scale socialist nationalisation and organise the resources of the country for the benefit of the working people, and thus to lay the foundations for a socialist order of society. These aims look to the future; but they are bound up with the present struggle. It is unity in action today, above all in the fight for peace against the present war drive, for the national independence of Britain against American domination, and for the social and economic needs of the people against the burdens of the rearmament programme, that alone will open out the path of advance forward to the victory of these future aims.

February 14, 1951. R.P.D.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES *are 12s. in Britain and 13s. overseas post-free.*

The BOUND VOLUME *for 1950 may be ordered at £1 from bookshops and newsagents; or, if all loose copies are returned in good condition, together with 8s. 6d., from The Manager, 134 Ballards Lane, London, N.3.*

LABOUR MONTHLY BY AIRMAIL.—*To non-European countries (including Hongkong) except as below, post free: Single copy, 3s.; a year's subscription, 36s.*

To China (except Hongkong), Australia, New Zealand, Japan and the Philippines, post free: Single copy, 3s. 6d.; a year's subscription, 42s.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

MORE LIGHT ON KOREA

D. N. PRITT, K.C.

AFTER *Light on Korea* was written and published early in July, 1950, a number of secret documents of the Syngman Rhee government were captured in Seoul by the North Korean government and communicated to the United Nations General Assembly and Security Council, supported by photostatic copies. There has been no denial of their authenticity, although the general Press has ignored them, as they confirm the North Korean case that the hostilities in Korea were begun by South Korean and American aggression, a case unpopular with Press Lords.

Study of these documents greatly strengthens the evidence put forward in *Light on Korea* as to the plans of the Syngman Rhee government and of the U.S. government for aggression against North Korea. It shows that the assertion on page 1 of *Light on Korea* (page 13, *Korea Handbook*) that 'this war was started by Syngman Rhee, with American encouragement if not on American orders' was a considerable understatement. Additional evidence was also given at about the same time (and again too late to be dealt with in *Light on Korea*) by Kim I Sek, the former Minister of Internal Affairs in the Syngman Rhee government, who was also captured by the North Korean forces. This evidence is not of course of quite the same cogency and certainty as that furnished by the documents, but it remains of no little value.

The earliest and not the least startling of the documents was written on the 3rd December, 1948, from Los Angeles by Peong Koo Yong, adviser of the foreign ministry of the Syngman Rhee government, to his 'Dear President' Syngman Rhee. After talking of the need for 'every true-hearted patriot in America, Korea, Japan and China' to fight against Communism, he continues:

> But to carry on the coming struggle to a victorious conclusion, the forces of defence such as the armies of America, Japan, China and Korea must be co-ordinated and led by a Supreme Commander with triple objectives, namely: The Japanese push through Northeastward and pass Vladivostok; Korean and American armies, after liberating our Northern territory, march through Liaotung peninsula and up to Harbin; and a re-vitalized Chinese Nationalist Army to recover China's lost territory, including Shantung Province; and after such a victorious conclusion, the Korean and American armies hold Manchuria until the cost of liberation

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

be fully repaid by means of the development of the national resources of that part of East Asia by the combined capital and labour of Manchuria, Korea and America, and that until democracy and peace be surely established there.

Early in 1949, as is well known, there were on the one hand extensive guerilla operations in South Korea, directed against the oppressive and unpopular Syngman Rhee government, and also some attempts on that government's part to work underground in North Korea. As an example of the latter, one may quote a letter from Myun Chang, the South Korean Ambassador to the U.S.A., to Syngman Rhee, dated the 6th April, 1949:

> General Wedemeyer has made the personal and confidential recommendation that we send well-trained, reliable and competent young people into North Korea with the obect of sowing distrust towards the Communist system and the national government and *preparing the way for the Republic*. (My italics throughout.—D.N.P.)

Plans captured at the same time as these letters showed schemes for destruction of bridges, organisation of railway accidents, destruction of many other buildings, assassinations of leaders and others, and infection of rivers and reservoirs with bacteria; and the general trend of the documents makes it plain that 'preparing the way for the Republic' means preparing for armed warfare started by South Korea against the North.

A few days after the recommendation of the American general had been passed on in this way to Syngman Rhee, we find the latter dealing more directly with the war he proposed to start against North Korea, in a letter dated the 10th April, 1949, to Cho Bion Ok, his personal representative in the U.S.A.:

> You should discuss this situation frankly, in strict confidence, with highly-placed *United Nations and United States* officials. You should inform them in strict confidence of our plans for the unification of North and South Korea. We are substantially ready for this unification at the present time in all respects but one: we are short of *arms and ammunition* . . . We must have sufficient armed forces to advance to the North, join up with the army in North Korea which is devoted to us, move the iron curtain back from the 38th Parallel to the River Yalu, and there guard the frontier against foreign infiltration.

There is no room for doubt here. Rhee means war, but he is hinting at his complaint, already noticed in *Light on Korea* pp. 3-4 (*Korea Handbook*, pp. 16-17), that the Americans were (at that stage) keeping him short of ammunition and holding him back

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

from his desire to attack North Korea and to march to (at least) the frontier of Manchuria.

At this stage comes some of the evidence of Kim I Sek and of other South Korean leaders who were captured by the North Koreans, that an invasion of North Korea had been planned for July-August, 1949—just at the period when the North Koreans were pressing their proposals for the unification of Korea by peaceful negotiation—but was frustrated by some of Syngman Rhee's forces going over to the North, by the lack of success attending the many incidents which Syngman Rhee provoked on the parallel, and above all by increased guerilla activity in the South.

On this topic it is interesting to read, from among the captured documents, some instructions given in July, 1949, by John J. Muccio, U.S. Ambassador to Syngman Rhee's government, to Generals Roberts and Page, the heads of the American Military Mission in Korea, *and also* to the then South Korean Ministers Sin Sen Mo, Kwon Syn Er, and Kim I Sek himself. (It may be odd for an Ambassador to be ordering about the Ministers of an 'independent' Government to which he is accredited; but the Americans are 'realists').

These instructions ran:

> During the months of July and August large-scale preparations are to be made for the campaign against the North. Consistent measures must be taken to prevent internal disorders; mass arrests of anti-governmental elements and members of the South Korean Labor Party must be made, and strict observance of the State Security Law ensured. I am confident that you will do everything necessary to carry out these arrests.

The North Koreans assert that, in the suppression of guerilla and other opposition thus ordered by the Americans, many thousands of people were imprisoned, tortured, and shot, and many more homesteads were burnt down. According to Kim I Sek, General Roberts personally worked out the plan and directed the operations for suppression of the National Partisan Movement. Mr. Muccio himself had urged the Ministers as early as January, 1949, to act ruthlessly, saying: 'From the humanitarian standpoint some people may say that this is wrong, but for the achievement of our ends these acts are fully admissible'.

It is worth noticing in its chronological position the confirmation lent by General Roberts to the North Korean assertion that the armed incidents on the parallel at this time were brought about by

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the *South Koreans*. On the 2nd August, 1949, speaking to a meeting of Divisional Commanders of the South Korean army, he said:

> My colleague and I are fully convinced that all the attacks in South Korea are reprisals and that almost every incident has been provoked by the South Korean security forces.

The frustration of the summer invasion plans left Syngman Rhee, of course, still thirsting for war, and the next of the documents, a letter from him to Dr. Robert Oliver, former American adviser to his government, who was in America, dated 30th September, 1949, runs as follows:

> I am firmly convinced that now is the psychological moment to take aggressive action and to join up with the units of the Communist army in the North which are loyal to us, so as to destroy the remaining units in Pyongyang. We shall drive Kim Ir Sen's men into the mountains and starve them out there. Our defence line must be set up on the Tuming and Yalu rivers. Our position will then be 100 per cent. better . . . To quote an old expression once used by Churchill: 'Give us the tools and we will finish the job'. You must convince American statesmen and American public opinion, so that they may tacitly consent to our starting operations and carrying out our program, *and also give us the necessary material support*. The longer we wait the more difficult it will be for us to do this.

What was in substance an answer to this letter was written on the 2nd October, 1949, by Cho Bion Ok to Syngman Rhee, as follows:

> I have read your letter to Dr. Oliver on the question of unification, or more accurately, on the liquidation of the puppet régime of North Korea, with close attention and interest. In the present circumstances the proposals you make in your letter are *the sole logical means,* indeed the cardinal method, of achieving the unification which we desire. I am inclined to believe, however, that the time is not yet ripe for the realisation of this program. In the first place, I doubt whether we are adequately prepared; and world public opinion will not approve acts of this kind . . . I have discussed this matter with Ambassador Chang and Dr. Oliver and we have come to the unanimous conclusion that this should be regarded as the fundamental plan of our Government, to be put into effect when we are ready and when the right moment has come.

As was noticed in *Light on Korea*, this was still the stage where the Americans were holding back the eager-bloodthirsty Syngman Rhee, who and whose agents were insisting that the unification of Korea should be achieved not by negotiation, as the North Koreans were always demanding, but by force of arms with American help. The Americans were plainly still taking the view that he was not yet ready. The speech of Syngman Rhee in which he complained

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

publicly of this restraint, as quoted in *Light on Korea,* pp. 3, 4 (and *Korea Handbook* pp. 16-17), was made less than a month after this letter.

In the course of that same October, General Roberts, the head of the American military mission in South Korea, who is mentioned above and appears frequently in the pages of *Light on Korea*, made another address to a meeting of Divisional Commanders of the South Korean Army, in which he made it clearer than ever to what source the incidents along the parallel were due. He said, obviously by way of rebuke to the irresponsible and incompetent leaders of the South Korean forces:

> Attacks on territory north of the 38th Parallel have been and will continue to be carried out *on my orders.* However, many military units launch arbitrary attacks against the North, squander masses of shells and obtain no results in spite of heavy losses. Attacks on territory north of the 38th Parallel may be carried out *by the National Defence Army only on the orders of the United States Military Experts' Mission.*

This is a frank enough declaration of the degree of control exercised by the United States over the aggressive operations of Syngman Rhee's forces.

A few days afterwards, we find Cho Bion Ok writing again to Syngman Rhee, emphasising not only that the unity of Korea was to be obtained by violence and not by peaceful means, but also that South Korea must 'work in' with the expected Third World War, and carry its military preparations further at once. He writes:

> I am absolutely convinced that Korea can be unified only *by utilizing the sovereign power of our Government.** Any policy of compromise or conference is out of the question . . . The cold war cannot continue indefinitely. All these world problems are insoluble without a third world war. Our unification plan must be adapted to the development of the international situation as a whole. Meanwhile the most important task of the Government is to increase our military and economic preparedness.

Cho Bion Ok, writing on the same day, gave Syngman Rhee an account of the efforts being made in the U.S.A. to secure that U.N.C.O.K., the United Nations Commission on Korea, whose supposedly impartial reports were later made the basis both of United Nations action and of the defence of that action by many Right-wing propagandists, should be 'reliable'. He reports with

*i.e., by levying war, with the assistance of the 'sovereign power' of the U.S.A.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

satisfaction—performing unconsciously a 'debunking' operation for lovers of truth—that, under the pressure of the U.S. delegation and State Department, the President of the General Assembly and the Secretary General of the United Nations had begun to give adequate attention to the 'selection' of appropriate members for the Commission. Syria, which had previously caused some unpleasantness in the Commission, was to be replaced by Turkey, and Secretary General Trygve Lie had appealed to the member governments of the Commission to appoint persons with strong convictions as their representatives on the Commission.

Cho Bion Ok further reported that Trygve Lie and his assistant Cordier (an American) had assured him that five former members of the Commission's Secretariat who were undesirable to the Syngman Rhee Government would be replaced and that a completely 'new and sound' Secretariat would be created.

This 'packing' of U.N.C.O.K. may explain, if it does not excuse, the nature of some of its activities and reports—which deserve a more thorough examination than there is space for in this article.

The next matter of importance that emerges from the documents is a statement made by Syngman Rhee at a Press conference held on the 30th December, 1949:

> In the new year we shall all strive as one man to regain the lost territory. Up to now, in view of the international situation, we have pursued a peaceful policy corresponding to the peaceful policy of the United States and the United Nations. We must remember, however, that in the new year, in accordance with the changed international situation, it is our duty to unify Southern and Northern Korea by our own strength.

Very soon after that, according to Kim I Sek, General Roberts spoke as follows to the Ministers of the Syngman Rhee government:

> The plan of campaign against the North has been decided upon. There is not much time left now before a beginning must be made with putting it into effect. Even though we shall begin the attack, we must nevertheless find a pretext providing some justification. The report of the U.N. Commission is of paramount importance in this connection. The U.N. Commission will naturally submit a report favourable to the United States. But you all know that you also must win the sympathy of the U.N. Commission and give your attention to this matter.

According to Kim I Sek, Sebald, the chief adviser of General MacArthur, visited Seoul in January, 1950, and assured Syngman Rhee that, when the campaign against the North began, the American fleet and aircraft based on Japan would fight on the side

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of the South Korean government. In February, 1950, Syngman Rhee, accompanied by the Chief of Staff of the South Korean army, went to Tokyo, where an agreement was reached with MacArthur for intensifying the preparations for an attack on the North. According to a statement by Mun Hak Won, Syngman Rhee's political adviser, MacArthur gave Rhee concrete instructions on preparatory measures, remarking that control of the military operations of Rhee's army must be transferred to himself (MacArthur).

It seems to have been a little later, about the month of May, that the Americans were convinced that the South Korean army was now fully prepared to attack. The proposed operations—which in the end started, as we know, on the 25th June, were plotted in some detail on a strategic map, drawn up jointly by the Syngman Rhee government and the American military representatives in Seoul, which was among the documents captured; and in an *American* film, also captured in Seoul and recently shown in various parts of Europe, Mr. Dulles, then on his famous June visit to Korea, is seen, with this map, in the front lines of the South Korean army near the parallel, looking over the North Korean territory they were then arranging to invade. This story, reported at some length in *Light on Korea*, can now be supplemented.

It is not uninteresting to read the report of Ambassador Chang, written on the 14th June, 1950, giving an account of a dinner party at which he had entertained Mr. Dulles just before the latter left Washington on this visit. Chang wrote:

> . . . This visit Mr. Dulles is about to make is most important in view of the fact that he has a strong voice in preparing decisions of the State Department concerning the Far East. I am confident that his visit may bring about a change in the Department's policy in regard to the Far East. I impressed upon him how much my people are looking forward to his visit, in the hope that it will bring about a firmer stand in the State Department on the anti-Communist issue. I summed up the hopes of our people and our Government as to Mr. Dulles' part as follows:
>
> He should make a strong statement assuring Koreans that the United States will stand behind Korea both in peace and in trouble, both economically and militarily . . .He (Mr. Dulles) said he was certain that the United States would not abandon Korea, and that he was even now preparing a statement to the effect that Korea would be backed by the United States. He said he would assure the Korean people that the United States would assist them.

Mr. Dulles kept his word, as was shown in *Light on Korea*, but

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the documents also disclose that he made a speech to Syngman Rhee troops on his visit, in which he said:

> Not even a strong opponent will be able to resist you. You will not have to wait long for the time when you will be able to display your strength.

On the 19th June, Mr. Dulles made the now notorious speech to the South Korean National Assembly, stating that the U.S. was prepared to *support* a South Korea in its fight against Communism; and the documents add a letter which he wrote on the following day to Syngman Rhee, as he was leaving Korea, saying: 'I attach great importance to the decisive part which may be played by your country in the great drama that is now unfolding'. Who exactly was 'unfolding' it? The United States, it appears.

It is no wonder that Syngman Rhee reported to Ambassador Chang on 18th June that Dulles fully agreed with his whole policy.

According to Kim I Sek, Dulles explained to Syngman Rhee and his Minister Sin Sen Mo that although the situation in the country after the attack on the North would be unpleasant, it would be necessary to hold out for at least one week, during which the United States would force the United Nations to act, and that land, sea and air forces would be mobilized in the name of the United Nations. 'Unpleasant', I suppose, because by all the American and Syngman Rhee activities recounted in *Light on Korea* and in this article, the North Koreans were fully alive to the danger—indeed the certainty—of an attack on them by the South, and were ready to repel it and to counter attack before American troops could arrive in large numbers. The North Koreans claim, it may be remarked, to have had reliable information of the South Korean invasion plans in May, 1950.

This fits with tragic exactness the course of the operations carried out by the U.S. government in relation to the Security Council and to its own military movements in the last week of June, 1950; and puts President Truman's 'Statement of the 27th June', in reality an insolent declaration of war on world communism in Korea, Formosa, the Philippines, and Indo-China issued without even waiting for the request from the Security Council, which was to come an hour or two later, for military aid to South Korea (see *Light on Korea*, pp. 13-14; *Korea Handbook*, pp. 29-30) into a new light. It must be promoted from the category of hot-headed jingoism to that of an infamous swindle worked on the peoples of the civilised world and of the U.S.A. in the interests of the warmongers of Wall Street and the Pentagon.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE LABOUR GOVERNMENT AND LABOUR'S FUTURE

QUÆSTOR

WHAT distinguishes the present Labour Government from a Liberal Government? Read the story, even in studiedly moderate accounts like Cole's *History of the British Working Class Movement* and Brailsford's *War of Steel and Gold*, of the last Liberal Government in Great Britain, from 1906 to 1914. You will see that it is as like that of the Labour Government of 1945 to 1951 as two peas in a pod.

The Asquith-Lloyd George Government of those earlier years made social concessions to the workers to stave off the growth of Socialism, but never hesitated to use the courts, the police and fire-arms against Labour. By playing skilfully on their dislike of the Tories and their ignorance of Socialism, it kept the workers on its side, using the stick and the carrot alternately. In the meantime, it shot down colonial peoples struggling to be free in India, in Egypt and in Ireland. And by its imperialist intrigues and alliances with other Great Powers who were engaged in the same pursuits, it landed Britain in the imperialist war of 1914.

What has changed since then? Above all, this—that in place of the Russian Tsardom, most of the Austro-Hungarian Empire, and part of the Prusso-German and Turkish Empires, there now exist the Socialist State of the U.S.S.R., the People's Democracies of Eastern and Central Europe, and the German Democratic Republic. None of these countries exploit subject peoples, as their predecessors did: in no part of the world are they fighting for markets, as the capitalists whom they drove out did: all of them are states in which the working people (to quote *Let us Face the Future*, with which the right-wing Labour leaders won their votes in 1945) 'have achieved a new dignity and influence through their long struggles against Nazi tyranny'.

But what of the other side of the picture?

At home, the Labour Government has made some social reforms. It improved the health service for the mass of the people, it spent more (in its first years) on education, it repealed the Tory Trade Union Act of 1927, it opened the way for rationalising the mines, railways, road and air transport by buying out the shareholders in them.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

But the 'nationalised' industries are administered by the same people who did so for the capitalists: and the latter still draw their profits through State bonds. This typifies the spirit of what changes have been made by the Labour Government. And in how many spheres have no changes been made at all—except possibly for the worse, in that a Liberal or Tory Government, applying the policy of Messrs. Attlee, Morrison and Bevin, would have had to reckon at any rate with opposition from the trade unions.

Order 1305 is used freely to make strikes illegal—not lockouts, as the flagrant example of the foundrymen locked out by Cravens shows. Gasworkers and dockers are arrested for leading their fellow workers in asserting the right to strike. Troops are freely used to break strikes in the docks and elsewhere. M.I.5 is openly used to organise espionage in the trade union organisations—by a Labour Government, which would be nothing without the unions! May Day processions in London, legal for half a century under Tory and Liberal Governments, are prohibited by a Labour Government. Equal pay for working women doing the same job as men, enjoined on numerous occasions by Labour Party Conference and Trades Union Congress alike, is refused, but full compensation for capitalist shareholders is granted. Toleration of Fascist and anti-Semitic propaganda and violence is defended by Labour Ministers: but a witch hunt against Communists initiated in the public services is caught up, on the Government's blessing, by bodies like the Middlesex County Council.

What is there, in all this, that Asquith and Lloyd George would have objected to—or Balfour and Bonar Law, Baldwin and Neville Chamberlain either, for that matter?

In the colonies, British political control—greatly weakened by two world wars and by initial defeat in the Far East—was withdrawn after 1945 from India, Burma and Ceylon, for fear of a gigantic rebellion in which Britain was doomed to disaster. In this the Labour Government showed no more sagacity than the Campbell-Bannerman Government after the defeat of the Boers in 1899-1902 and the Lloyd George Government, in face of Ireland's War of Independence in 1919-1922. But look rather at the regions of the earth where the Labour Government has still the preponderance in death-dealing weapons. There the picture is different. There the shareholders in British capitalist monopolies exploiting cheap colonial labour—*the essence of imperialism, as J. A. Hobson pointed out before the Bolshevik Lenin*—can still count on their dividends.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In Malaya, armed forces directed by the leaders of British Organised Labour are still burning, shooting, bombing and 'resettling' in concentration camps—an advance on the South African technique of 1900-1902 and the Black-and-Tan technique of 1920-22—the brown and yellow *majority* in the interests of a tiny white *minority* of tin mine owners and planters. In the African colonies, the shooting up of strikers and political demonstrators, the closing down of trade unions and working class and patriotic newspapers, are just as widely practised, just as much a 'regrettable necessity' to enforce British rule, under a Labour Government, as they were before. At the very time the British authorities were introducing their much-heralded 'constitution' on the Gold Coast—with its indirect franchise system copied from Tsarist Russia, its heavy load of nominated 'representatives' and its Governor's reserve powers—they showed how much it was really worth by prohibiting the importation into the 'free' Gold Coast of the British Workers Delegation's Report on the U.S.S.R. (*Russia With Our Own Eyes*). British investments must not be endangered by Gold Coast workers learning a thing or two from Russia! In Cyprus, the Labour leaders' answer to the self-determination demand of a united people is to increase police repressions and military concentrations: in Egypt, when the people want the British occupying forces in their country (after 70 years of promises!) to clear out, they are met with flat refusal: in Ireland, when the police state of the Belfast big business men needs military backing and the Labour Government finds it awkward to send British reinforcements, the Dutch are hired.

Where, in this picture, would Asquith or Balfour find themselves bewildered? Only that British organised Labour, which used at any rate to play some part in supporting protests against bloody and rapacious colonialism, now watches its leaders enforce it!

In foreign policy, there is not even the mitigation of a 'while . . .' or 'although . . .' to the stark brutal picture of betrayal of pledges and deliberate 'drift' to war.

From the moment the Labour Government was formed in 1945, unwavering and malignant hostility to the U.S.S.R. has been an outstanding plank of its policy. Atom bomb development, arranged in secret with the U.S.A. during the war but with the full knowledge of the chief Labour Party leaders, went on at full speed, and the Soviet proposals for prohibition and control were rejected and derided. The restoration of German trusts, the placing of high Nazi business men in official positions, resistance to moderate Soviet repara-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

From the Chinese film ' Daughters of China '.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

From ' Daughters of China ', now showing by the Britain-China Association.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tions demands lest Germany become a 'slum' (Bevin's words—it didn't matter about the awful 'slums' of destruction left behind in Russia by the Germans), and now rearmament of Western Germany under the direction of Nazi generals—this was British 'Labour' policy from the day that Bevin took office. Trade with the U.S.S.R. and the People's Democracies has been deliberately throttled by the Labour Government as it never was in the worst days after the Tory raid on Arcos in 1927—true, at the behest of the United States, but what is there redeeming in that? In Greece, in Spain, in Taiwan, the official representatives of British Labour give aid and comfort to the butchers of the working class, the suppressors of trade unions, the persecutors of religion. Every Soviet proposal for a reasonable compromise—'live and let live'—on reduction of armaments by the Big Five, on unification of Germany and Austria, on German demilitarisation, on leaving Korea to the Koreans: even on such an obvious question (one would think) as admitting to the United Nations those States whom the British Government doesn't like, side by side with those whom the Soviet Government doesn't like—all these and other opportunities for reducing tension have been rejected with contumely. Attlee and Morrison and Bevin never open their mouths in public without abuse of the Soviet Union dropping out of it, like toads from the lips of the bewitched Ugly Sister.

But in return, ah, what oily praise of the U.S.A. as a 'land of Socialism', what obsequious assurances to Truman, or the American Ambassador, or the latest Wall Street gangster-politician to appear in Britain with orders for the Labour Government, what loyal readiness to put British trade, British industry, British armed forces, British strategic bases, British films under the control of Uncle Sam! Never since Charles II became a pensioner of Louis XIV, and was able to defy his own people with the help of subsidies from abroad, has there been such a spectacle as the sovereign influence of Marshall Aid, and now of 'defence' and raw material 'allocations' from Washington, upon the foreign policy of the Labour Government—in the teeth of protests from M.P.s and rank and file alike.

And what of the fruits of this policy of ignoble subservience to the United States? Have they brought at least a rising standard of living? On the contrary: and even Attlee, forced into the most impudent falsehoods about the alleged low standard of living in the U.S.S.R., has not been able to deny that in Britain it is falling. Rising prices at every turn, the 8d. meat ration and the harmfully low fat ration, the shortage and high cost of coal, the shortages of

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

coarse grains for cattle and pigs (procurable from the U.S.S.R., but denied us because of the refusal to sell it machinery), the shortage of timber—these are the fruits for the people of the Marshall Aid system: with wage rates (1947=100) at 113 by November while the official cost of living index, notorious for its Whitehall optimism, stood at 116 (actually, food was up nearly 25 per cent., clothing 23 per cent., fuel and light 20 per cent.) Profits, on the other hand, are steadily rising—total up by 10 per cent. in 1950 compared with 1949, for 3,581 companies, or over 9 per cent. if you take 2,737 industrial companies.

The huge accumulations of raw materials in American hands, while shortages increase, have made it possible for the future to be drawn for us in the following terms, unprecedented in British history:

> Washington, however, has made it clear enough that at best she will part with these commodities only if she is completely satisfied that they will be used in the manufacture of armaments which will be available for defence against Russia and her allies. If this country engages herself to an arms programme of the scale and pace which Washington considers adequate, there is little doubt but the raw materials will be forthcoming. It seems highly probable that that is what will happen. (*The Times* City Notes, Dec. 10, 1950.)

Moreover, this situation spells no relief. Britain's lopsided Budget grows still more disastrous as the arms programme increases. From £780 millions a year, the cost goes up to nearer £1,500 millions, from 7 per cent. of national income to 13.6 per cent. (*Labour Research,* February, 1951). How is this cost to be met, when nearly half British exports came from 'the very industries which are most vulnerable to the effect of rearmament' (Mr. Gaitskell, Chancellor of the Exchequer, January 10, 1951) while the other half—from the lighter industries—are running into more and more bitter competition, particularly from Japan and Germany, America's chosen protégés? By more and more dependence on the U.S.A.—just as, in the 'good old days' before 1914, client Shahs and Sultans and Khedives used to prop their debt-ridden régimes by loans from London and Paris which left Persia, or Turkey or Egypt in a worse position than before.

Also, of course, by further attacks on living standards, of which there are plentiful prophecies on every hand, beginning with the Prime Minister himself. 'The levels of rearmament cannot be achieved without a step back in the ordinary civilian level', said the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

British chairman of the O.E.E.C. Executive in Washington on December 10.

But for what purpose are all these sacrifices, all this economic disequilibrium, all this rise in the level of armaments at the expense of 'civilian levels' required? Where do they lead? To the control of British forces in Korea by a MacArthur, who has proclaimed his aim the 'liberation of Asia', and in Europe by an Eisenhower, for whom the Nazi generals are brothers in arms. To the rearmament of the West German State—the State, that is, of the big militarist manufacturers and landowners, their mouthpiece the Kaiser in 1914 and Hitler in 1939—against the express wishes of the majority of the German people (Attlee himself admitted this in Parliament on February 13). To a world arms race, and particularly to still greater piles of American atom bombs on British soil—so that American lives may be economised at the expense of British towns. To the most brazen and sinister incitement to Fascist Greece and Yugoslavia to 'start something' at the expense of Albania, just as Syngman Rhee was openly incited to 'start something' in Korea. In other words, the more dependent Britain becomes, the more catastrophic and fatal become her prospects.

It is not surprising that, as Harry Pollitt writes in his introduction to the historic new programme of the Communist Party, *The British Road to Socialism*:

> The doubts and heart-searchings felt by so many people about the present situation and the future show that the British people realise that to drift along with the existing economic and social system can offer no hope. The people of Britain can look forward to a better future only if they take their country into their own hands.

There are many signs of revolt among the workers at large, and they are beginning to find an expression among the rank and file of the Labour Party and the Labour M.P.s.

Tens of thousands of engineers have shown, by their ban on overtime, that they will not accept the contrast between rising profits for the employers and falling standards for the workers. The Merseyside and Manchester dockers have done the same; and, when the Labour Attorney-General—of course, entirely without consulting his colleagues the Labour Ministers—prosecuted the London dockers' leaders as he did the gasworkers, under Order 1305, the London dockers showed that their patience, too, is coming to an end, in spite of material benefits gained from the recent award. The successful eight weeks' strike of the Duples Coachbuilders, and

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

numerous other smaller strikes on questions of trade union principle —particularly the defence of shop stewards and trade union freedom—have demonstrated that Messrs. Attlee and Gaitskell will 'run into stiff opposition', as the communiqués from Korea say, in their effort to save enough out of the food, clothing and other living expenses of the workers' families to pay for increased armaments.

Moreover, the massive protests against the threat of atom bomb warfare and the prospect of war on China, expressed in numerous spontaneous house-to-house collections of signatures to petitions and declarations, show that Mr. and Mrs. British Worker are thinking hard. It is sufficient to stand in the butcher's queue, or to call at the grocer's on a busy day, to hear things that spell no good at all to the Attlee Government. How this can be communicated to the organised Labour movement is well illustrated by the following case at a Scottish Coachworks, which deserves the widest publicity (*World News and Views,* February 3, 1951):

> A telegram was circulated in the departments on the following proposals: (a) Cease fire, withdrawal of all foreign troops, and peaceful settlement in Korea. (b) No use of the atom bomb. (c) Admission of China to U.N.O. (d) Meeting of Four Powers on Germany.
>
> Over 100 signatures were secured, with only two abstentions, and covering a representative section of the factory opinion. The telegrams, with names attached, were forwarded to the Prime Minister, with a covering letter to the M.P., Malcolm MacPherson. The M.P. replied, enclosing a copy of Hansard, and suggested meeting us during the recess. A room was booked in a Stirling hotel, a notice posted in the factory, the support of the Shop Committee was won and on Saturday morning twenty-six workers turned up, including Labour Party, non-Party and Communist Party.
>
> The M.P. travelled thirty-six miles from his home in Edinburgh, and the meeting lasted two and a half hours. All aspects of the international situation were covered, and certain promises and admissions were made by the M.P. At the finish he was left in no doubt as to the attitude of everyone present to the tie-up with America, MacArthur's provocation, the Peace Congress, German remilitarisation and the Z-class call-up. The sentiments of everyone were expressed by a Labour Member who said that, while he had argued for Labour in the past, he felt they were moving away from what he wanted, becoming a satellite of America, and being dragged into a war in which he would be cannon-fodder.
>
> The meeting over, everyone voted it a big success, and claimed that by perseverance common ground could be found for joint action.

Labour-Communist co-operation among Middlesex teachers to fight the witch-hunt started by the Tory County Council, and among the L.C.C. staff to fight a purge started by the Labour majority, are

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

further illustrations of how 'common ground could be found for joint action'.

This, indeed, is making itself felt in the protest movement within the Labour Party against the Government's foreign policy. From the middle of January to the middle of February, about sixty local Labour Parties—from East Edinburgh to Canterbury, from North Devon to Bradford City, from Cambridge, Horsham and Wimbledon to Penarth, Gloucester and Southport—apart from bodies like the Glasgow, Oldham and Coventry Trades Councils and the South Wales Miners' Executive, are recorded in the press as having denounced the rearmament of Germany. Many more have denounced MacArthur and the Korean war. The demand for a Four Power Conference is general in the Labour Party: that explains why Messrs. Attlee and Morrison show such venom in speaking of the U.S.S.R.

Even in the House of Commons this rising wave of protest has found some expression. On November 17 some 20 M.P.s tabled motions demanding agreement on Korea and discussions with the U.S.S.R. Later, over 40 M.P.s demanded an early meeting of the Council of Foreign Ministers, to promote (among other things) increased trade with all countries and gradual reduction of armaments. On January 23, large numbers of back benchers were demanding that China should not be branded as an 'aggressor' in Korea and that there should be no German rearmament. In the second week of February, 29 Labour M.P.s tabled various motions which denounced the arming of Germany.

But at this point the movement always met the argument which hamstrung the M.P.s—though it did not similarly affect the dockers, the engineers or the local Labour Parties—and enabled Attlee and Co. to go on defying the working class and their own rank and file. 'If you vote against us or abstain, you bring down the Government. That means an election, which the Tories may win. Anyhow, you will lose our endorsement as candidates'. To add weight to this argument, Attlee refused endorsement to the Labour candidate at Bristol West, for daring to oppose the new armaments.

It is time that men and women were found in the House of Commons with the courage—or if not the courage, then the clear light of reason firmly imposed on them by their local rank and file—to answer this specious argument. The answer is the same as the remedy for the economic consequences of dependence on America: or, if you like, for the Turkish Sultan's and Egyptian Khedive's

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

financial dependence on the foreign money-lenders. *The longer the disease runs on, the worse pickle you get into.* The more you surrender to Attlee's threats, the more shameful his surrenders to the U.S.A. will become: the more atrocious the burden of armaments, the more brutal the attack on the British people's standards, the more violent the abuse of China and the Soviet Union—and the more headlong the rush to war, because each round leaves the right-wing leaders in a better position to point to the rising menace of the Tory come-back. With what heart can the Labour Party rank and file fight an election today, on the war-and-capitulation record of Attlee and Co.? Yes, and with what heart will they be able to fight in three months' time? How will they be able to resist further inroads into British independence by the triumphant Wall Street gangsters? *There must be a halt somewhere and this is high time*—that is the answer.

But it would be impolitic to leave such a decision to M.P.s. In every constituency the people—whether inside or outside the Labour Party, but the trade unions, co-operatives and women's organisations should take the lead—in their own urgent self-defence should meet to demand a reversal of policy, as the coachbuilders quoted above did. They can demand that their M.P. should support such a reversal by a vote in the House, if necessary. Members of the Labour Party should insist on a special Labour Party Conference to take the necessary decisions. Enormous strengthening of the resistance to American war plans in France, Belgium, Germany, Italy, and the U.S.A. itself would be the result. Britain can yet be saved—if Labour takes its future into its own hands.

Next month (April issue) we begin a series of articles dealing with manufacture of armaments, entitled 'Merchants of Death'.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

CONCERNING PRACTICE

(Continued from the February issue)

MAO TSE-TUNG

Let us glance now at war. If the leaders of a war are people without adequate military experience, then at the initial stage they will not understand the deep guiding laws of a concrete war (e.g., our 10-year war in the period of agrarian revolution). At the initial stage they merely acquired personal experience in a number of battles, many of which ended in defeat for them. Nevertheless, this experience (the experience of victories and especially of defeats) made them understand things of an internal order, inherent in the war as a whole, i.e., the laws of this concrete war, made them understand strategy and tactics, and thus made it possible for them to lead the war with confidence. If a man without experience was put in a position of command he could understand the actual laws of the war only after certain defeats (after acquiring experience).

One often has occasion to hear how certain comrades, without deciding to undertake some work or other, declare that they cannot cope with it. Why cannot they cope with it? Because they do not possess a co-ordinated conception of the content and conditions of the work; either they have never encountered such work, or they have encountered it, but not much, consequently they cannot speak of the laws of this kind of work. After the circumstances and conditions of the work have been carefully analysed for them, they feel that, maybe, they can cope with it and show a desire to take it up. If these people, during a certain period of time, acquire experience in this work, and if they diligently investigate the circumstances, and do not regard things subjectively, one-sidedly, superficially, then they will be able themselves to draw a conclusion as to how the work should be conducted and their confidence in it will be enhanced to a considerable degree. Only those persons who regard things subjectively, one-sidedly and superficially, who, on arriving in a new place, do not interest themselves in their surroundings, do not study matters as a whole (the history of the matter and the present state as a whole), do not touch the essence of the matter (the internal connection of the various aspects of the matter itself and the internal connection of the given matter with other matters), complacently giving orders and instructions—are bound to make mistakes.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Hence the first step in the process of cognition is the initial contact with the external environment—the stage of sensations. The second step is the summing-up of the materials of sense perception, setting in order and re-arrangement—the stage of concepts, judgments and inferences. Only in the presence of fully adequate materials of sense perception (not fragmentary and incomplete) and their correspondence to the actual position (not erroneous perception) is it possible on the basis of these materials to elaborate a correct conception and logic.

There are two factors here which must be especially emphasised. The first has already been spoken of above, but it must once again be repeated here—this is the question of the dependence of rational knowledge on sense perception. He who considers that rational knowledge does not originate from sense perception is an idealist.

In the history of philosophy there existed so-called 'rationalists', who recognised only the reality of reason and denied the reality of experience, who considered that only reason was reliable, but that the experience of sense perception was unreliable; the mistakes of this tendency consisted in an attempt being made to put the facts upside down.

Yet the reliability of the rational basis stems precisely from sense perception, in the opposite case the rational basis would turn into water without a source, into a tree without roots, would turn into something only subjectively arising and unreliable. From the viewpoint of the consistency of the process of cognition sense experience stands in the first place, and we emphasise the importance of social practice in the process of cognition; only social practice can lead to the beginning of the emergence of human knowledge, the beginning of obtaining experience of sense perception from the objectively existing external world.

For a person with closed eyes and ears, completely divorced from the objectively existing external world, knowledge is quite impossible. Knowledge begins with experience—this is the materialism of the theory of knowledge.

The second factor is the deepening of knowledge, the necessity of the transition from the emotional stage of knowledge to the rational stage—that is precisely the dialectics of the theory of knowledge. If one considers that knowledge can remain at the lower stage—the emotional stage—assuming that only sense perceptions are reliable, but that rational knowledge is unreliable, then that means repeating the mistakes, well known from history, of 'empiricism'.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The mistakes of this theory consist in ignorance of the fact that the materials of sense perception are undoubtedly a reflection of the reality of the objectively existing external world (I do not say here that empiricism is only idealistic empiricism with its experience of internal reflection), but these materials are only one-sided and superficial, and the reflection obtained is incomplete, it does not reflect the essence of things. For the complete reflection of all things, the reflection of the essence of things, the reflection of the internal laws of things, the function of thought is indispensable, the working over of the rich material of sense perception, which consists in sifting the chaff from the wheat, the elimination of the false and the preservation of the real, the transition from one to another, from the external to the internal; for the construction of a system of concepts and theories the leap is indispensable from sensation (emotional knowledge) to rational knowledge.

This worked-over knowledge is not emptier and less reliable cognition, on the contrary it is, as Lenin says, still deeper, still truer and still more fully reflects the objectively existing thing, provided only that it is the scientifically worked-over product in the process of cognition on the basis of practice.

The vulgar philistines act differently. They bow down before experience and despise theory, as a consequence of which they cannot grasp the objective process as a whole, they lack a clear direction, they lack a great perspective and complacently enjoy their isolated successes and narrow horizon. If these people led the revolution they would lead it into a blind alley. Rational knowledge depends on sensation, on emotional knowledge, but emotional knowledge must develop into rational knowledge—that is the theory of knowledge of dialectical materialism.

'Rationalism' and 'empiricism' in philosophy do not understand the historical and dialectical nature of knowledge and although each of these tendencies contains one-sided truths (it is a question of materialist rationalism and empiricism, not of idealist rationalism and empiricism) nevertheless their theory of knowledge as a whole is erroneous. The movement of knowledge of dialectical materialism from sensation to judgment remains the same both in the small process of cognition (for example the cognition of one or another thing or one or another work) and in the large process of cognition (for example the cognition of society or revolution).

However, this does not complete the movement of knowledge. If the movement of knowledge of dialectical materialism were to halt

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

at rational knowledge, that would be only half the problem. More than that, from the viewpoint of Marxist philosophy it would be by no means the more important half.

Marxist philosophy considers that the most important question is not whether it is possible, having understood the laws of the objective world, thereby to explain the world, but in using this knowledge of objective laws for active transformation of the world. Marxism recognises the active nature of theory and its importance has found full expression in the following proposition of Lenin: 'without a revolutionary theory there can be no revolutionary movement'. But Marxism recognises the serious significance of theory precisely and only because it can guide action. A theory which is kept under a bushel and not applied in practice, such a theory, no matter how good it may be, cannot have significance.

Knowledge begins with practice, through practice theoretical knowledge is acquired, which must then turn anew to practice. The active rôle of knowledge is expressed not only in the active leap from emotional knowledge to rational knowledge; it is even more important that it should find expression in the leap from rational knowledge to revolutionary practice. Knowledge, having mastered the laws of the world, must be re-directed to the practice of transforming the world, used in the practice of production, in the practice of the revolutionary class struggle and national struggle, as well as in the practice of scientific experiments. Such is the process of testing and developing theory, a process which is a continuation of the single process of cognition.

The question whether a theoretical position corresponds to objective reality, as said above, is not fully decided, and cannot be fully decided, in the movement of cognition from sense perception to judgment. For the complete solution of this question it is necessary that rational knowledge should be turned again to social practice, that theory should be applied in practice, observing whether it can lead to the expected goal. Many theories of natural science are called truths precisely because these theories were not only discovered by natural scientists but were also confirmed in the subsequent practice of science. The reason why Marxism-Leninism is called a truth consists not only in the fact that this teaching was created scientifically by Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin but also in the fact that it has been confirmed by the subsequent practice of the revolutionary class struggle and the national struggle. Dialectical

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

materialism has become a universal truth because the practice of any person cannot go beyond its limits.

The history of human knowledge tells us that many theories were insufficiently trustworthy, but as the result of testing in practice their inadequacies were removed. Many theories were erroneous, but as the result of testing in practice their errors were corrected. Precisely for this reason practice is the criterion of truth, ' the viewpoint of life, of practice, must be the first and basic viewpoint of the theory of knowledge '.*

On this we have the notable words of Stalin: ' Of course, theory becomes aimless if it is not connected with revolutionary practice, just as practice gropes in the dark if its path is not illumined by revolutionary theory '.†

Does this complete the movement of cognition? We answer: It is completed and at the same time it is not completed. The knowledge of people who have participated in the practice of change occurring in some definite objective process at some definite stage of development (it is a matter of indifference whether it is the practice of change of some process of nature or the practice of change of some social process), as a result of the reflection of the objective process and of the active subjective function, moves from the sensuous basis to judgment and creates ideas, theories, plans or projects, corresponding as a whole to the laws of the given objective process. These ideas, theories, plans or projects are then applied in the practice of the same objective process and, if one succeeds in attaining the expected goal, i.e., in transforming pre-determined ideas, theories, plans and projects into reality, in the practice of the above-mentioned process or, if one succeeds in achieving their accomplishment in general outlines, then the movement of the cognition of this concrete process may be considered completed. For example, the realisation of any construction plan, the confirmation of any scientific hypothesis, the creation of any mechanism, the harvesting of any agricultural crop—in the process of transforming nature, or the success of any strike, the victory of any war, the fulfilment of any educational plan—in the process of transforming society, all this is considered as the attainment of the expected goal.

However, generally speaking, it rarely happens in the practice of transforming nature or society that the ideas, theories, plans or

*Lenin. Collected Works, Russian edition, XIII, p. 116.
†Stalin. Leninism, English edition, p. 15.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

projects predetermined by people are realised without the slightest alteration. This occurs because people frequently suffer from many limitations in accomplishing a transformation of reality; they are not only bound by scientific and technological conditions, but also by the development of the objective process and the degree of its expression (all aspects and the essence of the objective process are still not completely revealed).

In such a situation, owing to the appearance in practice of circumstances not postulated in advance, cases frequently occur of partial change of ideas, theories, plans or projects, but cases also occur of their complete alteration. This means that there are instances when pre-determined ideas, theories, plans and projects wholly or partially fail to correspond with reality, are wholly or partially erroneous. In a number of instances it is only after failures have been repeated many times that one succeeds in correcting erroneous knowledge, succeeds in achieving conformity with the laws of the objective process, and hence succeeds in converting a subjective thing into an objective one, that is to say, in achieving in practice the expected results. Thus, when this moment arrives, the movement of human cognition of some definite, objective process at some definite stage of development is considered to be completed.

From the viewpoint of the development of the process, however, the movement of cognition of people is not completed. Every process, whether it relates to nature or society, in consequence of internal contradictions and struggle, moves and develops in a forward direction, and the movement of human cognition follows and develops after it.

If one speaks of social movement, then truly revolutionary leaders must not only skilfully correct mistakes in their ideas, theories, plans or projects, as mentioned above, but must also, at the time of the transition of some definite objective process from some certain definite stage of development to another definite stage of development, skilfully in their own subjective knowledge join in that transition together with all the participants of the revolution, that is to say strive so that the proposed new revolutionary tasks and new projects of work correspond to the changes in the new situation. Changes in the situation of the revolutionary period take place impetuously and if the knowledge of the revolutionaries does not, corresponding with this, change impetuously, then it will be impossible to lead the revolution to victory.

It often happens, however, that ideas lag behind reality; this arises

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

for the reason that human knowledge is limited by many social conditions.

We are struggling against conservatives in our revolutionary ranks, because their ideology cannot develop in accordance with the changing objective situation, and this has manifested itself historically in the form of right opportunism. These people do not see that the struggle of contradictions has led to a development of the objective process and their knowledge remains at the same stage as before. These features are characteristic of the ideology of all conservatives. Their ideology is divorced from social practice, they cannot advance at the head of the movement of society and fulfil the rôle of a guide, they only drag along in the rear and complain about the too rapid advance of society, trying to drag it back and reverse its course.

We also struggle against 'Leftist' phrasemongering. The ideas of its representatives run ahead of the stage of definite development of the objective process; some of the phrasemongers take illusions for reality and others try forcibly to realise at the present time ideals which are only realisable in the future; their ideas are divorced from the contemporary practice of the majority of people, divorced from contemporary reality, and lead in action to adventurism.

The characteristics of idealism and mechanistic materialism, opportunism and adventurism, are the break between the subjective and the objective and the divorce between knowledge and practice. The Marxist-Leninist theory of knowledge, the distinguishing feature of which is scientific social practice, struggles determinedly against these erroneous ideologies. Marxists recognise that in the absolute universal process of the development of the universe the development of separate concrete processes is relative; in so far as the knowledge of absolute truth is expressed in the knowledge of concrete processes at a definite stage of development, to that extent at any moment knowledge consists of relative truths only. Absolute truth is made up of an infinite number of relative truths.* The development of the objective process is a development full of contradictions and struggle.

Every dialectical movement in the objective world can sooner or later find its reflection in human knowledge. The process of coming into being, development and dying away in social practice is infinite, just as the process of coming into being, development and dying away in human knowledge is infinite.

*V. I. Lenin, Collected Works, Russian Edition, Vol. XIII, p. 110.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Practice, directed towards changing objective reality and based on definite ideas, theories, plans and projects, constantly moves forward and human knowledge of objective reality constantly becomes more profound. The movement of change does not cease, just as human cognition of truth in practice never ceases. Marxism-Leninism in no way puts an end to the discovery of truth, on the contrary it constantly opens up paths for cognition of truth in practice. Our conclusion: we are for a concrete historical unity of the subjective and the objective, of theory and practice, of knowledge and action; against all 'Left' or 'Right' erroneous ideologies divorced from concrete history.

In the present epoch of social development responsibility for correct knowledge and transformation of the world has been placed by history on the shoulders of the proletariat and its political party. Throughout the world and in China the process of the practice of transforming the world, determined on the basis of scientific knowledge, has reached a historic moment, a moment of tremendous importance, unprecedented in the entire history of human existence.

This consists in the complete overthrow of darkness throughout the world, and in China also, and its transformation into an as yet unprecedented world of light. The struggle of the proletariat and of the revolutionary people for the transformation of the world includes the fulfilment of the following tasks: transformation of the objective world, as well as of our subjective world—the transformation of our capacity for cognition, the transformation of the connection between the subjective world and the objective world. In one part of the globe—in the Soviet Union—these transformations are already being carried out. And the Soviet people are at present speeding up this process of transformation. The Chinese people and the peoples of the rest of the world in their turn are at present passing, or will pass in the near future, through the process of these transformations.

The so-called transformed objective world includes also the opponents of transformation, hence their transformation has to pass through a stage of compulsion, only after which will they be able to pass to the stage of being conscious for themselves. The time when mankind throughout the world arrives at conscious transformation of itself and the world will also be the epoch of communism throughout the world.

Through practice to discover truth and through practice to confirm and develop truth. To pass actively from sensations, from sense

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

perceptions to rational knowledge, from rational knowledge to active leadership of revolutionary practice, to the transformation of the subjective and objective world. Practice—knowledge, then again practice and again knowledge—this form is infinite in its cyclic repetition, but the content of each cycle of practice and knowledge becomes raised relatively to a higher level. Such as a whole is the theory of knowledge of dialectical materialism, such is the view of dialectical materialism about the unity of knowledge and deeds.

FROM THE *LABOUR MONTHLY* OF 25 YEARS AGO

CITRINE ON A SOVIET PRISON

In no country in the world are greater social and economic experiments being tested than in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. A few months ago it was my privilege, in conjunction with my colleague, Mr. George Hicks, General Secretary of the Amalgamated Union of Building Trades Workers, to visit Moscow and see for ourselves some of the methods by which the social problems of the new Republic are being tackled . . .

Every prisoner is given the opportunity of working at some useful trade and every two days which they work is counted as three days' imprisonment. The effect of this, therefore, is to reduce very materially the length of detention of those who undertake the work. The acceptance of work is not compulsory, but it has such advantages that there are very few prisoners who do not avail themselves of this opportunity.

They are paid the full trade union rates of wages, but one half of this is retained by the authorities until the end of the detention period, when the prisoner receives the balance in a lump sum, which should be sufficient to give him a decent restart in life. They work in three shifts of eight hours usually, but not every workshop is necessarily working the full three shifts.

If the prisoner is a family man with dependants he can allot half his wages for the maintenance of his family . . .

Anyhow if there is such a thing as reformative treatment for crime, the Russians are making a whole-hearted attempt to explore it to the full . . .

It was a remarkably interesting and educative experience, and left one with the feeling that there is an earnest desire on the part of all concerned with the administration to strive for the elevation of those unfortunates, who for its own protection the Russian Community have been reluctantly compelled to deprive of their liberty.

Walter M. Citrine, then Acting Secretary, T.U.C. General Council, now Lord Citrine, in *A Soviet Prison*, March, 1926.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A PIOUS INFORMER

I Believed. By Douglas Hyde. (Heinemann, 10*s.* 6*d.* 303 pp.)

FAMILIAR types in the Hogarthian gallery of English characters have been the Pious Pimp, the Pious Prostitute and the Pious Slave-Trader. Now we have the Pious Informer.

Mr. Hyde is a very pious person. He combines his highly questionable 'revelations' of the usual hoary 'Red Plot' with assertions of his close relations with the Deity. He claims that, after his eyes had been opened to his sinful past and he had decided to return to the atmosphere of the conventicles for which he had been originally trained as a missionary (only this time to a more fashionable and wealthy conventicle), he made the transition from the sinful world to the Shrine of the Cross. He is mistaken. He made the transition to the Shrine of the Double Cross. The Jesuit priest to whom he went for advice instructed him, according to his own account, to lead a double life, and to continue to pretend to be a sincere and honest revolutionary in the service of the working class press while actually owning allegiance elsewhere and maintaining secret contact with other quarters. 'It was a difficult position spending my time between two worlds', he writes, and entitles another chapter 'The Two Watertight Compartments'. Such are the peculiar standards of 'honesty' and 'morality' on which this pattern of virtue loves to preach and expatiate at nauseating length for the edification of those who have remained in the service of the working class movement. For six months at least prior to his exposure, according to his own account, Hyde lived a lie. Perhaps for longer? (Incidentally in a revealing note on p. 62 he admits that already in 1937—that is, during his early years in the party—he desired to 'confess' to a priest, regarding himself as 'up to my eyes in sin'; thus the connection may date back considerably longer.)

The responsibilities of the revolutionary working class movement require certain standards of honour, honesty and decency from its adherents. It is to the eternal credit of the millions of noble men and women who have chosen this thorny path that the overwhelming majority fulfil these standards, often in the face of considerable hardship, intimidation, victimisation and manifold forms of pressure. A few give way, and are easy meat for the ghouls of the corrupt reptile press in the service of the millionaires.

At the present day the war-drive of American imperialism, which finds Communism the leader of the fight for peace, requires a plentiful supply of spicy 'revelations' and eagerly snaps up any produced by convenient ex-Communists to blacken Communism. A torrent of this kind of material has accordingly been poured forth with lavish publicity through the millionaire press and broadcasting systems. In ordinary circumstances it would not be worth while to waste space on this literature of the gutter. But in present conditions, when this filth is being poured down millions of innocent throats as an integral part of the preparations for a reactionary war, it is necessary to deal with the latest English specimen of this genus.

Hyde played no part in the leadership of the Communist Party. He functioned on the staff of the *Daily Worker* between 1940 and 1948—mainly war years, during which many of the best and ablest younger cadres of the party were serving, often with high distinction, in the armed forces, and sometimes weaker elements had to be given positions in the apparatus. He never even saw a meeting of the Executive Committee—which does not

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

prevent him from describing such meetings from the depths of his own imagination. His account of his own exploits in such functions of the apparatus as he fulfilled is as egotistic and misleading as his account of other members is inaccurate. His fables are mainly based on gossip, tittle-tattle and hearsay on matters on which he could have no direct knowledge. A favourite device is to introduce some particularly gross slander against Communism in the form of alleging that a 'leading Communist' (always anonymous) 'said to me'—and then will follow one or another of the most fantastic inventions of the enemy press against Communism, such as that the real aim of Communism is mass misery, or that the thought of millions of human beings in agony causes fiendish glee in the breast of a Communist, or similar nursery tales to terrify idiots.

I had never much occasion to come in contact with Hyde. I recall him at the little editorial group meetings which Bill Rust used to lead, and of which he gives such a ludicrously inaccurate account. He was a dim, damp, Uriah Heep type of figure, never able to take part in the hurly-burly of boisterous discussion, and when tackled on questions of his department, answering in a mumbling apologetic fashion—regarded by all as a weak vessel, to be helped along as best possible. Unfortunately, with the kindly tolerance which is the besetting weakness of the working class movement, until experience teaches vigilance, his colleagues too easily ascribed to him their own straightforwardness and goodness of heart, and did not take note in time of signs that should have been suspect to more experienced eyes.

To analyse and refute all the nonsense and misleading charges which litter the pages of his book would be a tedious task. It must suffice to take a few specimens.

1. *Communist Morality.* Hyde repeats the familiar priestly slander that Marxism or Communism teaches the bourgeois doctrine of 'free love' or sexual promiscuity. He is plainly ignorant of Lenin's scathing indictment of the bourgeois doctrine of 'free love' (conversation with Clara Zetkin, and letter to Inessa Armand). But if he is ignorant of theory, he has no right to be ignorant of facts. Has he never heard of the lives of Marx and Jenny von Westphalen, of Lenin and Krupskaya, of Harry and Marjorie Pollitt, of Bill and Jean Gallacher, that he dares to pour out this filth which only rebounds on its author and on the dirty-minded priests who spread it? If here and there a few younger party members are affected by the habits of a loose bourgeois environment, this is a reflection of bourgeois or bohemian, not of Communist influence. It only reveals that they are not yet sufficiently developed to have related their Communism to their private lives, and is no more a reflection of Communist influence than the adoption of American slang or copying of Hollywood film star fashions is to be regarded as a sign of Communism.

2. *Communist Leadership in Britain.* The Communist Party elects at its Congress an Executive Committee, which elects in turn a Political Committee to conduct current business and a General Secretary. The General Secretary is the responsible Leader of the Party, and the Executive Committee and the Political Committee function as a collective team in association with him. All this is perfectly straightforward and the familiar practice of all kinds of working class organisations. But it is too straightforward for the press lords; there is nothing sinister about it. So Hyde has to seize upon an ordinary working member of the collective leadership, and solemnly present him as the hidden secret power, the hand of the Kremlin and all the rest of the schoolboy Dick Barton nonsense. These exercises in

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

fantasy are comic tomfoolery for those who know the facts and the rôle of Harry Pollitt in the Party; but of course they are pure jam for the sensation-mongers of Fleet Street.

3. *Communism and the Soviet Union.* Hyde presents the conventional stereotyped picture about 'Russian domination' of the Communist movement, sacrifice of national interests to Russia, etc. It is a wonder that these bright fiction-mongers have not yet discovered that the Kremlin invented the mythical figures of Marx and Engels, and that the Communist Manifesto was really translated from the Russian—but no doubt we can await with confidence an American Senate Commission Enquiry getting round to this presently. Hyde's method is assertion without evidence: the usual 'Moscow directive' formula to explain everything. Where he attempts to give facts he generally gets them wrong. Let us take a concrete example. On the dissolution of the Communist International he states (p. 170):

> We had always publicly denied that the Communist International's policies were dictated by the Russian Party or the Soviet Government. . . Now, however, the Russians had dictated that the C.I. was to be brought to an end.

The implication is that the dissolution of the Communist International was not decided by its leading body, but was decreed independently by 'the Russian Party or the Soviet Government'. The facts are that the resolution for the dissolution was signed by Dimitrov, the Secretary, Ercoli (Italy), Florin (Germany), Gottwald (Czechoslovakia), Kolarov (Bulgaria), Koplenig (Austria), Kuusinen (Soviet Union), Manuilski (Soviet Union), Marty (France), Pieck (Germany), Thorez (France), Zdhanov (Soviet Union), Bianco (Italy), Dolores Ibarruri (Spain), Lehtinen (Finland), Anna Pauker (Rumania) and Rakosi (Hungary)—three representatives of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union out of seventeen. It is worth placing on record that every member of the Executive Committee of the Communist International was consulted beforehand to cast their vote on the proposal of dissolution.

4. *Communism and the Fight against Fascism in Spain.* Hyde touches bottom in his slanders against the anti-fascist fighters who gave their lives in Spain. He asserts that Communists sent non-Communists to their death as 'cannon-fodder'. Of the 533 anti-fascist fighters who gave their lives in Spain, just over half were Communists, including the finest younger representatives of the party, whose loss is irreparable. Harry Pollitt has dealt adequately with this foul slander in his article in the *Daily Worker* of January 30.

5. *Communism and the War in 1939.* Hyde repeats the usual Press fantasy:

> The Party's Central Committee had met one day at the King Street headquarters to draw up a stirring manifesto to the British people calling upon them to sacrifice all in the great anti-fascist struggle. After hours of discussion the text was finalised. Then unexpectedly in walked the British representative to the Communist International whom everyone had thought was still in Moscow. He took one look at the Manifesto and told the leaders they would have to scrap it.

Hyde was never at any meeting of the Central Committee, and all his facts are wrong. The only meeting of the Central Committee which discussed the attitude to the war in 1939 met during the last week in September and the beginning of October. It did not meet for 'one day', but, including adjournments, for over a week. It never 'finalised' any 'text' about 'the great anti-fascist struggle'. From the outset there was a keen discussion, with

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

clearly defined majority and minority views, before there was any report available about the discussions of the International Executive. Any subsequent report of such discussions was only a further factor contributing to a discussion and formation of opinion already independently in progress. As a result of the discussion a majority view was reached and embodied in the statement issued.

6. *Communism in the Election of 1945.* Hyde asserts that the party, 'including our leaders', completely over-estimated the chances of the Communist candidates, and were overwhelmed with 'surprise' at the polls recorded. This is pure invention. As he singles out the case of my own contest against Amery in Sparkbrook to prove his thesis, it is worth placing on record that I predicted before the counting of the votes, both to our electoral committee and at the centre, an estimate which was within less than 150 votes of the actual result. If Hyde at his news Editor's desk chose to give a fantastically exaggerated picture, we regarded this at the time as merely well-meant amateurish exuberance, though subsequent experience would now appear to justify a harsher view of his rôle at the time, since his behaviour created confusion, discredited the party by unbalanced exaggeration, and thus spread disillusionment among less experienced sections.

7. *Communism and the Marshall Plan.* The most glaring example of Hyde's propaganda methods is in his treatment of Communist policy in relation to the Marshall Plan. Every Communist warning and prediction with regard to the Marshall Plan has now been proved by events, with the colossal advance in living standards in the Soviet Union and People's Democracies of Eastern Europe, and the depression of standards, American domination, increasing burdens, rearmament and war drive in Western Europe. Yet Hyde has the insolence in 1951 to repeat the American propaganda legend that the opposition of Communists to the Marshall Plan was based on the desire to prevent economic recovery and create mass misery—'working consciously and deliberately to produce economic crisis, unemployment, social misery, malnutrition'. Can he produce the tiniest fragment of evidence for such an allegation from any statement anywhere of any Communist representative or publication? Of course not. But this does not abash him. This is the kind of calumny the ruling class would like to spread against the Communist Party. The obliging Mr. Hyde is always there to help them. Utilising his familiar technique, he takes a piece of obvious vulgar American propaganda and places it in the mouth of an anonymous 'Political Bureau Member':

> It would not be possible, he said, quickly to raise the standard of life of the people in the new democracies since theirs were mainly peasant economies. But there was another way of raising their *relative* standards, and that would be by reducing that of the countries of the West. 'And that shouldn't take the Party long', he added.

This kind of absurdity (which is of course eagerly lapped up by the gullible Cummings tribe) is so gross as to be stupid. If I were to announce that the other day 'a leading Labour Cabinet Minister' said to me: 'Aha! What shall we do next to deceive and oppress further the British proletariat?', it would not be necessary to ask: Who? When? Where? The statement carries its own refutation.

These are only specimens from a morass. It is a measure of the degradation of the kept press in this country that it should wallow in this morass.

R. PALME DUTT.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

MARX AND ENGELS

Marx-Engels Selected Works. (Two Vols. Lawrence and Wishart, 1950, 6*s.* 6*d.* each.)

THESE two splendidly bound volumes enable everyone to acquire a basic Marxist library at a fantastically low price. They contain 1,098 large pages of print on good paper and cover every aspect of the classical writings of the founders of Marxism.

It is especially important to notice that they are not a mere reprint of the rather shabby war edition previously available from the publishers at a higher price. The earlier edition was called 'Selected Works of Karl Marx' but included many works of Engels and also general introductory articles on Marxism by Lenin and biographical reminiscences of Marx by Lefargue and Liebknecht.

The new addition is much more logical. It consists entirely of basic works by both Marx and Engels arranged in chronological order. Not only is the arrangement and editing better but it contains much new matter, including the following: Marx's detailed letter on Proudhon; the final text of the Rules of the International Workingmen's Association as adopted at the London Conference of the First International in September, 1871 (the previous edition gave only the Provisional Rules drawn up by Marx in 1864); Marx's Prefaces to the First and Second German editions of Capital; Engels on the Housing Question; Engels' article On Authority, written in 1873 for Italy (hitherto unknown in English); Engels' Introduction to Dialectics of Nature and his essay on the Part played by Labour in the Transition from Ape to Man; the whole of Engels' Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State; and a number of letters of Marx and Engels not included in the previous edition.

It should be noticed also that in all cases the translations have been carefully revised and a number of inaccuracies corrected. The publishers are to be commended for providing each volume with both a name and subject index. All in all, an indispensable and irreplaceable compendium.

CLEMENS DUTT.

WOMEN AND COMMUNISM

Women and Communism. Selections from the Writings of Marx, Engels, Lenin, Stalin. (104 pp. Lawrence and Wishart. 3*s.* 6*d.*)

DURING the past year hundreds of women, with no previous experience of political activity, were drawn into the work of collecting signatures to the peace petition; and it is true to say that on the whole the best collectors were women. This shows what a great access of strength there would be to the working-class movement if the women were as active as the men.

What is it that holds them back? First, as Engels showed, the family is so organised in capitalist society that the husband stands to the wife as the bourgeois to the proletarian. Consequently, the working-class housewife is doubly exploited—as a member of the working class and as a wife. And secondly, the ideas propagated by the capitalist class are designed to perpetuate this state of affairs. Women are naturally inferior to men; woman's place is in the home; and so on.

In this volume these lies are exposed. It is not true that women have at all times and in all countries occupied an inferior status to men. The social subordination of the one sex to the other is a historical phenomenon of the same nature as the subjection of the working class to the ruling class. A woman is no more naturally inferior to a man than a worker is to a capitalist. It follows that the fight for social equality between the sexes is part of

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the struggle for socialism. As Lenin wrote in *Letters from Afar*:

> If we do not draw women into public activity, into the militia, into political life; if we do not draw women away from the deadening atmosphere of household and kitchen; then it is impossible to secure real freedom, it is impossible even to build democracy, let alone socialism.

By teaching them the truth, this book will inspire many women to greater confidence in themselves and so strengthen their determination to overcome the obstacles to political activity. It will also teach many men how to help their wives forward instead of standing in the way. And it will give to all alike a deeper understanding of the whole history of the class struggle.

GEORGE THOMSON.

AN EYE-WITNESS ON NEW CHINA

New China—Friend or Foe? By Alun Falconer. (128 pp. Naldrett Press. 3*s.* 6*d.*)

MR. FALCONER'S book is so easily the best of recent eye-witness accounts of the birth of the new China that it is important to appreciate why this is so. There are two main reasons. Firstly he rejects Acheson's nonsensical (and, coming from a U.S. Secretary of State; to say the least, audacious) summing up that the Chinese people's victory over Chiang Kai-shek represented 'a decision by default' and shows that it was the outcome of 'a revolution that could not be contained'. It is a short and inevitable step from this to the great truism that Mr. Falconer quotes from Madame Sun Yat-sen: 'The new China is a non-fissionable product. . .' Secondly Mr. Falconer is not concerned with trying to show the British Foreign Office how it might most promisingly pursue its real aims in China. His

what do you know about

RUMANIA?

Here's your chance to get to know all about the Rumanian People's Republic in four beautifully-produced books now available for the first time in English

PHOTOS

"Aspects from the R.P.R." 100 magnificent photos showing every aspect of the new life. Price 2s. (post 4d.)

ART

"Art in the R.P.R." Handsomely produced and lavishly illustrated 134 page book of people's art. Price 4s. 6d. (post 6d.)

PLANNING

"Planned Development in the R.P.R." Reports by leading Communists on Rumania's National Plan. Price 1s. 6d. (post 4d.)

REVIEW

"Rumanian Review". Quarterly cultural Magazine containing articles, criticism, short stories and reproductions. 4s. yearly. 2s. for 6 months

COLLET'S BOOKSHOPS

66 Charing Cross Rd., W.C.2. 36 Deansgate, Manchester. 193 Haverstock Hill, N.W.3.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

whole book is outstanding as a plea for honest friendship between China and Britain. What he makes perfectly clear is this: to suggest that the people of China will sacrifice the friendship of one country to gain that of another is in the final analysis more stupid than pernicious because it ignores all that the new China stands for.

Thus freed of the intricate complication of trying to fathom the 'split personality' of the Chinese Communists and the knotty problem of demonstrating how the Chinese can best be weaned away from the Russians, the author aims at showing nothing more than what has happened in China, why it had to happen and why over 400 million people are exalted and enthused as never before because it has happened. The impression is that, proceeding on this simple basis, Mr. Falconer finds the job easy. The coverage he has given in the restricted space of only 120-odd pages is quite extraordinary. Even greater is the achievement in dealing with it all in the most lively and interesting manner. The rôle of the Communist Party and agrarian reform, the formation of the Central People's Government and the rehabilitation of Manchurian industry, the new Marriage Law and the Trade Union Law, stabilisation of Shanghai's currency and the question of latinising the Chinese language as well as a host of other things are all dealt with — of necessity briefly and sketchily in some cases but always with a keen eye to the salient and most interesting points. Where the author gives a first-hand account—as in the description of Shanghai's liberation—and when he allows a Chinese to tell a part of his story for him—as in the case of the member of the Rural Service Corps who had returned to Shanghai after studying land reform in south China, the reader experiences his one regret—namely that Mr. Falconer did not make greater use of this kind of thing. It is easy to imagine that, much as he would have liked to, a journalist acting as assistant editor of a Shanghai paper in 1949-50 could not be everywhere at the same time.

As the most readable, exciting and useful account of the new China's birth and first year, this book deserves the widest possible readership throughout the Labour movement. And the publishers have certainly done their bit by making it available in such an attractive edition at such low cost. Finally, a minor point, but one that is not without interest and importance; sympathetic though it is, the Vicky cover drawing does not reflect the spirit of the new China so admirably conveyed in Mr. Falconer's text.

R. WESTGATE.

A BOTANIST ON LYSENKO

Lysenko is Right, by James Fyfe. (65 pp. Lawrence and Wishart. 2*s*. 6*d*.)

THERE has been a great need in this country for a booklet which would explain to the ordinary man and woman what the 'Lysenko controversy' is really about—something fuller than a newspaper or review article and yet not so lengthy as to discourage the non-specialist, and, above all, not assuming a more or less extensive knowledge of biology on the part of the reader. In *Lysenko is Right* James Fyfe, a botanist with considerable experience of agricultural plant breeding, has gone a long way towards meeting this need. He is particularly successful in explaining why certain British 'scientists' have been in such a hurry to condemn Lysenko and Michurinism. He has much that is of value to say about Soviet science and stimulates in the reader a desire to go further and learn more about the work of Soviet scientists. It would be misleading to say that his booklet is

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

entirely 'easy reading'. It can, however, be said that it is thoroughly interesting and worth-while reading.

L.E.

A SCOTS NOVEL

Bull's Penny, Margaret Hamilton. (230 pp. Macgibbon and Kee. 9*s*. 6*d*.)

MARGARET Hamilton's first novel, *Bull's Penny*, traces the life of its central character, Geordie McCallum, from boyhood days on Ramma to a bed in the old men's Ward of a Glasgow Poorhouse. The penny given to Geordie when a mere laddie at Shennadale Fair becomes a symbol of his faith that everything will work out all right in the end. It does not work out like that. One feels that Geordie's instincts are sound enough and when tested he is not always the spectator of events. Some of the other characters know exactly what they want and are prepared to fight and die to get it. Geordie is not always so certain, but he is with them just the same.

Margaret Hamilton has tried to set a new pattern away from that which is usually set out in Scottish novels and plays with their record of gloom and doom. Scotland, and the working class generally, needs more writers of progressive outlook. *Bull's Penny* is a welcome break and we look forward to more and still better novels from its author.

WM. LAUCHLAN.

PUBLICATIONS RECEIVED

BOOKS

The Winnipeg General Strike. D. C. Masters. University of Toronto and Oxford University Press. 160 pp. 26s.
Modern Norway. W. Warbey, A. M. F. Palmer, A. J. Champion, M.P., A. Whyte. Fabian Publications. 182 pp. 6s.
Testament for Social Science. Barbara Wootton. Geo. Allen & Unwin. 198 pp. 15s.
The Last Optimist. J. Alvarez del Vayo. Putnam. 405 pp. 18s.
History of Oil Workers' International Union (C.I.O.). Harvey O'Connor. Oil Workers' International Union. 442 pp.
The Social and State Structure of the U.S.S.R. V. Karpinsky. Foreign Languages Publishing House, Moscow and Collet's, London.
On the Party. Liu Chao-chi. Foreign Languages Press, Peking. 206 pp.
Women in New China. Foreign Languages Press, Peking. 56 pp.
700 Millions for Peace and Democracy. Foreign Languages Press, Peking. 82 pp.
Third Blue Book: For Peace and Democracy in Greece. Democratic Organisation of Greece. 174 pp.
Peace is our Answer. Poems by Jack Lindsay, Paul Eluard, Pablo Neruda, Louis Aragon. Lino cuts by Noel Counihan. Collet's. 40 pp. 4s.
In Defence of Philosophy. Maurice Cornforth. Lawrence & Wishart. 260 pp. 12s. 6d.
Crisis in Britain. Robert Brady. Cambridge University Press. 730 pp. 37s. 6d.

PAMPHLETS

The Sino-Soviet Treaty and Agreements. Foreign Languages Press, Peking. 26 pp.
Facing Facts in Formosa. Union of Democratic Control. 12 pp. 3d.
Tenants' Guide to Action. National Council of Tenants' and Residents' Associations. 32 pp. 6d.
Lukacs and Socialist Realism. Jozsef Revai. Fore Publications. 38 pp. 1s 6d.
The Church Demands Peace. Bishop M. Novak. Religion and the People. 12 pp. 6d.
Background to New Hungary. Neil Stewart. Fore Publications. 29 and x pp. 1s.
Hands Off Korea. E. W. Campbell. Current Book Distributors, Sydney. 12 pp. 1d.
American Armed Intervention in Korea. Current Book Distributors, Sydney. 23 pp. 3d.
Communist Leaders Speak. Current Book Distributors, Sydney. 32 pp. 6d.
Crisis In Japan. Union of Democratic Control. 24 pp. 1s 3d.
Over The Counter: A Survey of Distribution. Labour Rerearch Department. 20 pp. 6d.
Britain's Trade With Poland. British Polish Friendship Society. 20 pp. 4d.
Patriotism and Internationalism. S. Titarenko. Soviet News. 16 pp. 1d.
Bulletins on Soviet Economic Development; May and December, 1949; August and September, 1950. Alexander Baykov. Dept. of Economics, University of Birmingham. pp. 28, 28, 28, 36. £1 for four.
We Can Save Peace. British Peace Committee. 46 pp. 6d.
Once Again. Basil Davidson. Union of Democratic Control. 26 pp. 1s.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the newsagent if you will of being short-sighted or prejudiced; he has a case. So these London readers propose to give their newsagent confidence that he will lose nothing, knowing he will increase his orders if he displays. When they offer to pay for the extra display copy (but it will have been snapped up by then!), they suggest he takes more next month on the same terms. Note: there is a limited number of free display cards for newsagents who want one.

PRITT THE WINNER

Pritt pamphlets are always winners—how his *The Truth About the U.S.S.R.* is selling! Judging from overseas advance orders alone, it will be hard to meet the demand. Early orders save delay in reprinting. So . . .! (see cover).

A septuagenarian who recently lost a leg, and through added expense could not renew his sub, thanks 'Overseas Reader' who provided a free subscription. He is delighted 'to carry on reading *Labour Monthly* with no break.'

The first quarter is always money-tight; if we are down, as I expect, in February, we must make up in March. So I am looking now for more new friends to take the fund's weight; such as 'Red Sergeant', joining the ranks (excuse me, Sarge!) with 'Socialist Airman' and 'Socialist Sailor'. Among the old readers is a Scot, who wrote that 'R.P.D.'s notes are worth a fiver a line', and he paid for a line, too! Pleasant to get a donation from members of a North Country Socialist Society who 'appreciate a breath of reason and sense'. Readers interested in the 1s. a month stand-in for the home town, started by the two readers jointly known as 'Exeter', will sympathise with the 'better half', laid low with severe illness. The January total was

£42 17s. 6d.

STAND-IN money came from:

'Exeter', standing-in for Birmingham, Crediton, Dublin, Newcastle-under-Lyme, Norwich, Swansea, Turton (Lancs) and Weymouth, 8s; 'Billie', standing-in for Tonypandy 'in memory of Lewis Jones', 1s; J. Tuckett, standing-in for Manchester, 1s; D. Mayo, standing-in for Plymouth and Rottingdean, 2s; 'Bath', standing-in for Aylesbury, Cardiff, Totnes, Warwick and Watford, 5s; 'Socialist Airman', standing-in for Merthyr Tydvil, two months, 2s; 'Islingtonian', standing-in for St. Pancras (pre-paid).

STEADY money came from:

'Exeter', 2s; 'Bristol', 3s; Anon., 'Whitchurch', 1s; K and J.E. 'Central Edinburgh', three months, 7s 6d; J.L. for 'East Edinburgh', three months, 15s; 'Bath', 5s; 'Nita, in memory of Bert McDonald of Dundee', 6s 8d; 'Belfast' (pre-paid); 'Aberdeen' (pre-paid); 'Islington' (pre-paid); 'New York' (pre-paid); 'Debt Repaid' (pre-paid); 'Socialist Airman', 2s; 'Socialist Sailor', £1; 'Red Sergeant', 5s; J. Tuckett, 1s 6d; D. Mayo, 10s; E. D. McCallum, 5s; H. Willcox, 2s; D. M. Clarke, 10s; L. Rowan, 6s; H. N. Humphries, 3s 6d; H.G.B., 2s 6d; R.F.B., £3; A.F.O., 1s 6d; 'L'Humanité', 3s; H.S.M., 2s 6d; S. Mills, 10s; D. H. Strathern and Friends, 5s; T. Flood, 2s 6d; T.W.R., £1; Royston Green, 3s 6d; R. McLeod, 5s; F. Renouf, 5s; Olivia Greene, £2; S. Morrissy, 10s; D.M., 6s; P. N. Brinson, 10s; J. A. Purton, 7s 6d.

Other contributions include:

F. Brown, 4s; A.I.P. Rees, 8s; B. Spary, 8s; F. W. Thompson, 8s; Arthur E. Turner, £1; G. Dowling, 8s; W. S. Hemp, 8s; K. B. Kay, 4s; L. Shapiro, 8s; G.H.M. (Canada), 7s 8d; A. Dawson, 3s; W. P. McCann, 3s; M. Gluckman, 8s; N. Looker, 2s; M. Lines, 3s; H. Criddle, 8s; R. Todd, 8s; F. Wignall, 5s; M.W.S. (South Africa), 10s; L. Dight, 8s; H. Dight, 8s; D. Warner, 8s; T. Kilborn, 5s; G. R. Sandison, 8s; D. F. Oakeshott, 10s; L. G. A. Clark, 8s; R. Haydn Davies, 5s 6d; D. H. Strathern, 8s; T. Chapman, 2s; J. Bacon, 4s; M.G. (India), £1; E. G. Stout, 8s; 'Indicus', 7s; H. E. Cole, 8s; J. Besserman, 8s; R. Barrett, 10s; D. Spencer, 5s; A. R. Trim, 8s; H. Eldridge, 8s; W. J. White, 8s; J.D. (Australia), 7s; W. Moncrieff, 8s; F.C.C., 4s; E. J. Widdowson, 8s 6d; L. S. Kidd, 8s; H. Williams, 6s 9d; J. H. Wilson, 2s; 'Friend of Rumania', £1; 'Aussie', 5s; Irvine, 'Ayrshire', £1 14s; C.M.W., 3s; J. C. McAllister, 8s; A. J. Ramsey, 2s; H. Martin, 8s; L. D. Moreland, 3s; L. R. Borsley, 8s; 'Virginia' (U.S.A.), 11s 6d; F. Gardener, £1 3s; M.I.S. (U.S.A.), £1 8s 2d; B.E. (U.S.A.), 10s 6d; M.S. (U.S.A.), 10s 6d; J.L., 19s 9d.

Our thanks to you all.

Co-op. Number L.99482.

ANGELA TUCKETT.

134 Ballards Lane, London, N.3.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

LABOUR MONTHLY

Pamphlets

30th Year 1951 Series

No. 1

THE SHAW MEMORIAL

Memoir by R. Palme Dutt, with Shaw's 1921 article 'Dictatorship of the Proletariat'. 32 pp. 1s.

No. 2

THE WAY TO PEACE

by J. D. Bernal, F.R.S. 24 pp. 6d. (Out of print.)

No. 3

THE TRUTH ABOUT THE U.S.S.R.

by D. N. Pritt, K.C. 16 pp. 6d.

No. 4

MAO TSE-TUNG'S

remarkable writings on knowledge and practice. 16 pp. 6d.

Order from all newsagents, or **Dept. O, 134 Ballards Lane, London, N.3.**

GORKY AGAIN!

A companion volume to the new (7s. 6d.) edition of *Mother*, now you can get

Childhood

A moving story of pre-revolutionary Russia.

443 pages : 4s. 6d. (post 4d.)

From all progressive bookshops and

COLLET'S BOOKSHOPS

London: 66 Charing Cross Rd., W.C.2.
40 Great Russell St., W.C.1.
Hampstead: 193 Haverstock Hill, N.W.3.
Manchester: 36 Deansgate.
Hull: 62 Carr Lane.

LABOUR RESEARCH

March issue includes:

'Rearmament and its Effect on the Economy'.
'The German War Criminals'.
'Bank Chairmen Speeches'.

Monthly 6d.; p.a., 7s.

LABOUR RESEARCH DEPARTMENT
2 Soho Square, London, W.1

CIRCULATION-RAISER No. 1

Please send a free specimen copy to:—

(1) Name.....

Address.....

(2) Name.....

Address.....

You may mention my name (Signed)..... .....

or/ I enclose note to be sent on. Address.....

.....

To the Manager, 134 Ballards Lane, London, N.3

Published by the Proprietors, The Trinity Trust, 134 Ballards Lane, London, N.3, and printed by Dorchester and District Newspapers, Ltd. (T.U.), Dorchester, Great Britain

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED